

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, October 25, 1919.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 22, 1919.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania withhold the call for a quorum for a moment?

Mr. SPENCER. I ask the Senator to withhold the call for a few moments.

Mr. PENROSE. Would not the Senator from Colorado rather have a quorum present?

Mr. THOMAS. No; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has the floor, and I merely wish to offer a resolution. I will say to the Senator that I shall not occupy any time.

WILLIAM O. JENKINS.

Mr. MYERS. As in legislative session, I ask leave to submit a resolution and have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was read, as follows:

Whereas it is authoritatively reported that so-called bandits have kidnapped and carried into captivity William O. Jenkins, American consular agent at Puebla, Mexico, and are holding him for a ransom of \$150,000: Therefore be it

Resolved by the United States Senate, That it is the sense of this body that the President of the United States and the Secretary of War should at once use all the armed forces and power of the United States to recover and have immediately the said Jenkins alive or his abductors dead.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over.

THREATENED COAL STRIKE.

Mr. THOMAS. I introduce and ask to have read at length a joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) assuring the national administration of the unqualified support of the Congress in dealing with the impending strike of coal miners in the United States was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the officers of the United Mine Workers of America have ordered all miners in the bituminous coal mines of the United States to strike on Saturday, the first day of November next, notwithstanding efforts of the Secretary of Labor to secure some basis of negotiation suspending or preventing same; and

Whereas the representatives of said organization have arbitrarily rejected the President's earnest counsel for compromise; and

Whereas strikes in other fields of industry heretofore ordered and still unsettled threaten to continue indefinitely; and

Whereas demands for increased wages and shorter hours accompanied by expressed or implied determination to enforce such demands if necessary by strikes in other fields of industry have been and are being made; and

Whereas the threatened strike of the bituminous coal miners will, if carried into effect, interfere with, injure, or suspend nearly all the national pursuits and industries, inflict continued and incredible hardship and suffering upon all the people of the United States and provoke disorder, violence, bloodshed, and insurrection throughout the land; and

Whereas the enforcement of the law and the maintenance of order for the security of life and property and the protection of the individual citizen in the exercise of his constitutional rights is the first and paramount duty of the Government and must be at all times vigorously and effectively safeguarded by the use of every means essential to that end: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That we hereby give the national administration and all others in authority the assurance of our constant, continuous, and unqualified support in the great emergency confronting us, and call upon them to vindicate the majesty and power of the Government in enforcing obedience to and respect for the Constitution and the laws and in fully protecting every citizen in the maintenance and exercise of his lawful rights and the observance of his lawful obligations.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on Monday next, after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall call up the joint resolution just offered and ask for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

WILLIAM O. JENKINS.

Mr. MYERS. I merely desire to say that as objection was made to the consideration of the resolution I offered, I ask that it may go over until the next legislative day, and at that time I shall call it up and have some remarks to make upon it, and I shall also ask for action upon it.

Mr. THOMAS. I withdraw the objection I made to it.

Mr. MYERS. Then I ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the Senator take some time in explaining the resolution, because it is very broad in its scope.

Mr. MYERS. I think it explains itself.

Mr. SMOOT. There are so very few Senators here now that I think it is the part of wisdom not only for the Senator but for all to have it go over until the next day, and then the Senator can take time to explain the resolution.

Mr. MYERS. Then I will withdraw the request at this time, but I shall call it up later in the day or on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over.

SACCHARIN IN FOOD.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, a few days ago I submitted a resolution concerning the use of saccharin, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been considering the question. I notice in the RECORD that yesterday the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] introduced some correspondence from the Department of Agriculture in regard to the matter.

During the administration of President Roosevelt he appointed a committee of experts to investigate and pass upon the healthfulness of certain ingredients of food, and among these was saccharin. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD the supplemental report of the Referee Board of Scientific Experts upon the subject of saccharin, Prof. Ira Rensen, chairman.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF THE REFEREE BOARD OF SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS, PROF. IRA REMSEN, CHAIRMAN, JANUARY 13, 1912, ON SACCHARIN.

"1. The findings of the referee board, based upon what would seem to be convincing, experimental evidence, are that small quantities of saccharin, up to 0.3 gram per day, are without deleterious or poisonous action and are not injurious to health. This being so, it would seemingly follow that foods to which small quantities of saccharin have been added—in amount insufficient to result in a daily intake of more than 0.3 gram—can not be considered as adulterated, since foods so treated do not contain any added deleterious ingredient which may render the said food injurious to health.

"Admitting that large quantities of saccharin—over 0.3 gram per day—taken for long periods of time may impair digestion, such evidence can not consistently be accepted as an argument in favor of the view that smaller quantities must constitute a menace to health. It is often claimed that any substance having a deleterious effect on health when taken in large amount must necessarily be injurious, even when consumed in very small quantities, and that it is dangerous to differentiate on the basis of quantity.

"There is, however, no justification for such a view from a physiological standpoint. Common custom, for example, sanctions the free use of vinegar or dilute acetic acid as a preservative; yet it is well known that in large quantities acetic acid is a dangerous substance. Common salt, while harmless when

taken in small quantities, may become a serious menace to health if taken in larger quantities. The hydrochloric acid of the gastric juice is not only harmless, but is essential for the welfare of the body; yet when its concentration is increased beyond a certain point it becomes a poison. It is evident, therefore, that the decision as to whether a certain substance is or is not injurious to health must take into account the quantity of the substance that is involved. The referee board is compelled, on the basis of experimental evidence, to hold to the view that addition of small quantities of saccharin to food does not constitute an adulteration, since there is no evidence that small quantities of the substance are deleterious to the health of normal adults.

"2. The addition of saccharin to foods, in large or small quantities, does not, so far as the findings of the referee board show, affect in any way the quality or strength of the food. This statement is not in any sense contradictory to or lacking in harmony with the statement that the addition of saccharin to a food as a substitute for cane sugar is a substitution involving a reduction in the food value of the sweetened product, and may thus result in a reduction in its quality. The simple addition of saccharin to a food can not, in the opinion of the referee board, be considered as an adulteration through any reduction in the strength or quality of the food, since no such effect follows its addition to the food. On the other hand, the substitution of saccharin for cane sugar, for example, in any food product may result in a decided lowering of food value, and this must certainly be considered as an adulteration.

"In the opinion of the referee board, the use of saccharin in food in quantities that might constitute a menace to health is impossible, since its extreme sweetness would naturally limit its consumption by the individual to amounts below what might prove injurious (in harmony with the conclusions expressed in the original report of the board). On the other hand, the possibility of substituting saccharin for sugar, thereby lowering the food value of the sweetened products, is a serious menace, and one that should be carefully safeguarded."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I have here Senate concurrent resolution 14, introduced by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It provides for a survey of the activities of the several departments, divisions, bureaus, offices, and agencies of the Government which relate to the protection and promotion of the public health, sanitation, care of the sick and injured, and the collection and dissemination of information relating thereto. The resolution provides for the appointment of a committee of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate directs me to report back the resolution favorably without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) submitted by Mr. FRANCE October 22, calendar day, October 23, 1919, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee be, and is hereby, created, consisting of three Members of the United States Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, respectively, to make a survey of and report on those activities of the several departments, divisions, bureaus, offices, and agencies of the Government of the United States which relate to the protection and promotion of the public health, sanitation, care of the sick and injured, and the collection and dissemination of information relating thereto.

SEC. 2. That such committee is directed and empowered to report to the Congress not later than March 1, 1920—

(a) The statutory powers and duties conferred by the Congress on any department, division, bureau, office, or agency of the United States Government to carry on any work pertaining to the conservation and improvement of the public health, together with any rules and regulations authorized or promulgated thereunder;

(b) The organizations now existing in the Federal Government for the purpose of carrying out these powers and duties, together with the personnel of, appropriations for, and expenditures by each department, division, bureau, office, and agency during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919;

(c) The coordination now existing between said departments, divisions, bureaus, offices, and agencies, together with any conflicts, overlapping or duplication of powers, duties, functions, organization, and activities;

(d) The cooperation and coordination now existing between the Government of the United States and the government of the several States or extragovernmental agencies for the conservation or improvement of the public health;

(e) Such further information as such committee may deem proper;

(f) Such recommendations as such committee may deem advisable to offer for the improvement of the public health work of the United States Government.

SEC. 3. That such committee be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to ad-

minister oaths, and to employ experts, deemed necessary by such committee, a clerk and a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before such committee, such stenographer's service to be rendered at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page; the expenses involved in carrying out the provisions of this resolution, one half to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate and the other half out of the contingent fund of the House; and that such committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall object to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. FRANCE. Does the Senator object?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. FRANCE. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection. The resolution is a most important one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are here after having taken a recess for the consideration of the treaty, and I can not consent to any matter of that kind coming up at this time. While the resolution may have a very admirable purpose, I think it will require more consideration than can be given under present circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], there being no morning hour, the Senate having taken a recess instead of an adjournment, put into the RECORD quite a lot of telegrams, resolutions, and other literature in relation to the league of nations.

I have here a pamphlet that some one sent to me entitled "World crisis and the League to Enforce Peace," which I assume is sent out by that organization, in which it is stated that up to July 28, 1919, that organization had raised in general subscriptions and membership fees \$597,780.85. Whether it has raised money in any other way than by general subscriptions and membership fees deponent further saith not. Since that statement was volunteered three months have passed; the campaign conducted by it has become much more strenuous and insistent; and \$1,000 checks are now being demanded peremptorily.

I send to the desk and ask to have read a telegram which was sent to me by Mrs. Eva Mason, of the Connecticut Federation of Women's Clubs, together with her reply to the same.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator from Connecticut has no objection, I should like to call for a quorum. I suppose he has the usual long list of telegrams.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If I may have unanimous consent to have this matter read before that is done, I have no objection.

Mr. PENROSE. Let it be read, and then I desire to call for a quorum.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have no objections either way. The Senator can suit himself. He can suggest the absence of a quorum now.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gay	McKellar	Smoot
Bankhead	Gerry	McLean	Spencer
Borah	Hale	Moses	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Harding	Myers	Swanson
Calder	Harris	New	Thomas
Capper	Henderson	Newberry	Townsend
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Nugent	Trammell
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Underwood
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Wadsworth
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Kellogg	Polindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Kirby	Pomerene	Watson
Dillingham	Knox	Sheppard	Williams
Edge	La Follette	Shields	
Fletcher	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	
France	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. GAY. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] on account of sickness.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WORCOTT] and of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] on account of illness in their families.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] are detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are absent on public business.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXROOT] are detained

in committee. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] are in attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. Unanimous consent has been given for the reading of certain papers presented by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Derby, Conn., October 24, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. BRANDEGEE: Believing the inclosed message may have a personal interest for you as a Senator, I herewith hand you a telegram addressed to me, from Vance McCormick, chairman of finance committee of the League to Enforce Peace. As I am an advocate of wise reservations for the league of nations covenant, I wired Mr. McCormick "I would regard the contribution of a dollar to the expense of a campaign to secure votes for ratification of the covenant 'without amendments or reservations' an expression of disloyalty to America's best interests." As the president of a woman's organization in the State of Connecticut numbering 6,000 members, I am a bit curious to know how at this date a possibly large campaign fund of American dollars can be exchanged for votes for an unaltered covenant. Any suggestion you may make for my enlightenment will be appreciated.

Asking you to confer the favor of returning the telegram, as I desire to put it on file as a souvenir, I am

Loyally, yours,

EVA CHILD (Mrs. JAMES R.) MASON,
President Connecticut Federation of Women's Clubs.
[Telegram.]

Mrs. EVA MASON, Derby, Conn.:

NEW YORK, October 22, 1919.

In this moral and political crisis League to Enforce Peace—William Howard Taft, president; A. Lawrence Lowell, chairman—has great and necessary responsibility of leading and securing expression of public demand for prompt ratification of peace treaty and league of nations covenant without amendments and without reservations that would require resubmission or separate peace with Germany. Business uncertainty and industrial unrest will continue throughout world until ratification starts life again in normal channels. Will you join others in contributing \$500 toward expenses of campaign?

HERBERT HOUSTON, Treasurer,
GEORGE WICKERSHAM,
VANCE MCCORMICK,
CLEVELAND DODGE,
OSCAR STRAUSS,
Finance Committee.

Bush Terminal Sales Building, New York.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] called my attention to the fact that the little souvenir from which I read a minute ago issued by the League to Enforce Peace states that the \$597,780.85 which they say they have raised by general subscriptions and membership fees has been received during the four years over which its activities have extended and up to July 28, 1919. They state as a conclusion, I will not say as a warning, that—

When the treaty of peace and the league of nations covenant were submitted to the United States Senate on July 10 the fight for a league of nations entered its final stage.

To which I agree.

With ratification by the Senate, the task which the League to Enforce Peace set itself in 1914 will have been accomplished. Then will remain the further task of assisting to guide the world through the first untried years of cooperation under the league, a task in which the counsel and influence of leaders in all walks of life will be essential.

The gentlemen who are drawing these salaries and leading the world have no intention of relinquishing the snap upon which they have stumbled. Having raised almost three-quarters of a million dollars—pretty nearly the proportions of a national campaign fund—simply by circularizing the benevolent and charitable people to whom they present one side of the controversy, they have no intention of letting go the possibilities developed to educate and lead the world in its moral duties and activities.

I send to the desk now a letter from Mr. R. W. Kellough, of Tulsa, Okla., who sent me the little souvenir from which I have quoted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire the letter read?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I desire that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.
The Secretary read as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., October 14, 1919.

Senator BRANDEGEE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Herewith I hand you some of the propaganda being put out by the League to Enforce Peace, which has made an effort to force the patriotic Senators to ratify the league, which would surrender the sovereignty of this country. I am sending you this with full authority for you to use as you may deem best. You and your associates who are opposing the ratification of this fool league of nations are the "minutemen" of the present day, so remember Lexington and Bunker Hill and keep the good work up.

In replying to Senator HITCHCOCK's statement that only thugs and ignorant people are against the league you might call his attention to the breaking up of a meeting at Ardmore, Okla., where Senator JAMES A. REED attempted to speak against the league. This meeting, so it is reported, was broken up by organized thugs gotten together by politicians in that locality, while the majority of the people were in favor of Senator REED's going ahead with the argument and were undoubtedly against the league.

With kindest regards, yours, truly,

R. W. KELLOUGH.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have no extended comment to make except that this \$600,000, nearly three-quarters of a million dollars, has simply been thrown overboard; that is all there is of it. The sending of these telegrams and hysterical messages all over the country has simply increased the mail receipts and the telegraph tolls. The lady who inquired of me how the money expended can be swapped for votes on this question is onto the game, Mr. President. It can not be swapped for votes and has not been swapped for votes and no vote can be changed or even affected by the expenditure of the whole three-quarters of a million dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, apropos the reference in one of the communications sent to the desk by the Senator from Connecticut about the "minutemen of liberty" and that sort of thing, I present to the Senate and ask to have inserted in the RECORD the resolution of the Mississippi branch of the American Legion passed at Jackson, Miss., and wired me by the chairman on October 22.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

VICKSBURG, MISS., October 22, 1919.

Senator JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The State convention of the Mississippi branch of the American Legion at Jackson, Miss., yesterday adopted the following resolution:

"Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Convention of the American Legion, That this body recommends that the peace treaty be adopted without reservation and that copies of this resolution be sent by wire to President Wilson, Senators WILLIAMS, HARRISON, JOHNSON, and LODGE."

ALEXANDER FITZHUGH, State Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, apropos another letter presented by the Senator from Connecticut about somebody refusing to contribute to the campaign fund of the League to Enforce Peace, I send to the desk and ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from Herbert S. Houston, treasurer of the League to Enforce Peace, containing an open letter to my old friend, former Speaker CANNON, of the House of Representatives, answering a letter written by him some time ago very similar to the one sent up to the desk by the Senator from Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be inserted in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

[From League to Enforce Peace, 130 West Forty-second Street, New York. Immediate release.]

"NEW YORK, October 22.

"In a letter to Representative JOSEPH G. CANNON, of Illinois, Herbert S. Houston, treasurer of the League to Enforce Peace, declares that an overwhelming majority of private citizens in this country favor ratification of the peace treaty and the league of nations covenant, and asks the ex-Speaker if he thinks these people have any less regard for the Constitution than the Senators and Congressmen who are attacking the covenant on constitutional grounds.

"Mr. Houston's letter, which was given out here to-day, answered a letter which Mr. CANNON made public recently in Washington, after he had been asked to help finance the cam-

paign of education waged by the League to Enforce Peace in behalf of the league of nations. Mr. Houston's letter follows:

"HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. CANNON: In your open letter replying to the request for a subscription to the funds of the League to Enforce Peace you say that these funds are to be used to influence Senators to break their constitutional oaths. Your 46 years in Congress must have given you a surprisingly low estimate of the average Senator's capacity and character. Do you think a Senator like HALE, of Maine, any less mindful of his oath of office because he gives heed to the views of his State, again surveys the treaty and the league of nations covenant, and finally decides to vote against the Shantung amendment? Nineteen other Republican Senators did the same thing. Surely they are not 'serving two masters' in listening to the arguments and opinions of their constituencies before reaching their final decision on the treaty and the covenant. And every dollar of the funds to which you were asked to contribute—I can speak from full knowledge as treasurer of the league—goes toward educational effort to enlighten the country on the meaning of the covenant and on the country's duty to join the league of nations in order to make permanent the peace which our soldiers helped to win.

"The 14,000 ministers of the gospel who have just petitioned the Senate to ratify the treaty with the covenant must be familiar with the passage of Scripture you quote in your letter and also with the Constitution of their country, and still they join in an urgent plea for the league of nations. You would not, I am sure, deny them this ancient democratic right of petition or claim that its exercise was an effort to influence Senators to break their oaths of office. You sat at the feet of Abraham Lincoln too long to think anything so opposed as that would be to the spirit of our institutions. The League to Enforce Peace holds to the sound Lincoln maxim that you can't 'fool all the people all of the time,' and that is the reason it is undertaking to help enlighten them on the issues involved in this great league of nations contest. And they are surely being enlightened, as you will find if you take the trouble to check up the sentiment in the Danville district or in any other section of the country.

"As an index to public sentiment, let me remind you that at the convention of the American Bankers' Association in St. Louis the other day a referendum vote taken by a St. Louis newspaper of the twelve hundred and odd delegates showed over 800 of them in favor of the ratification of the treaty and covenant without amendments or reservations, and only 27 votes were recorded as being against the ratification of the treaty. As a wise and successful banker yourself, you know how accurately the banker, and particularly the country banker, can gauge the sentiment of his community. And this referendum among American bankers showed the same result that hundreds of referendums among all classes of people throughout the country have shown. The referendum vote in the American Federation of Labor was practically in the same proportion as the vote of members of the American Bankers' Association. Is it possible for you to believe that these people, undoubtedly representing an overwhelming majority of your fellow countrymen, have any less regard for the Constitution of the United States or for the sovereignty of America than have you or any other Senator or Congressman?

"With kind personal regards, I am,

"Yours, faithfully,

"(Signed)

HERBERT S. HOUSTON,

Treasurer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, in conclusion, Mr. President, I will read this, because it is a letter from three senators from Massachusetts—Winchester, Mass. I do not know them, but perhaps the Senators from Massachusetts do.

Mr. LODGE. Three senators from Winchester, Mass.?

Mr. WILLIAMS (reading):

We earnestly urge immediate ratification of the peace treaty and covenant of the league of nations with no reservations that require reopening of negotiations at Paris.

I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. I was not aware that Winchester had three senators in the legislature, but I have no doubt they have.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WINCHESTER, MASS., October 22, 1919.

TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Care of Hon. JOHN S. WILLIAMS.

DEAR SIRS: We earnestly urge immediate ratification of the peace treaty and covenant of the league of nations with no reservations that require reopening of negotiations at Paris.

Respectfully,

A. C. NEWELL,
F. M. NEWELL,
E. P. BOND.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask to have read the resolutions of the American Legion, Georgia Division, adopted at Atlanta, Ga.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"THE AMERICAN LEGION, GEORGIA DIVISION,

Atlanta, Ga.

"Be it resolved, And it is hereby resolved by the American Legion, Georgia Division, in convention assembled at Atlanta, Ga., October 15, 1919, that it is the sense of this convention that the treaty of peace as submitted to the Senate of the United States and embodying the league of nations should be adopted as submitted without reservation, amendment, or interpretation; and it is further

"Resolved, That the Senators of the State of Georgia be furnished copies of this resolution and that they be requested to support the treaty of peace and vote against any reservation, interpretation, or amendment thereto."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD, in reply to what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] presented in criticism of the League to Enforce Peace, a statement showing the nature of its organization, its officers, the method of its financing, the use of league funds, a report of its State and county branches, the official commitments of the league, the character and type of work carried on by the league, and the national provisional committee of the league—in fact, a complete statement of the League to Enforce Peace.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I. ORGANIZATION.

"The League to Enforce Peace was organized as the response of a large group of leading Americans to the greatest moral crisis of history—the outbreak of the European war. It was felt that something must be done to organize the world against the recurrence of such a catastrophe. About a hundred and twenty-five leaders of American thought of all political parties, creeds, and professions joined in the call for the organization meeting in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, June 17, 1915. Several hundred of the leaders of the Nation, comprising many of the outstanding figures in international law, politics, political science, and letters, equally representative with the callers of the convention, came together and, through the organization of the League to Enforce Peace, began the movement for the establishment of a league of nations. The representative character, the disinterested motives, the nonpartisan nature of the league have remained to this day as definite and distinct as at that time. (For list of provisional committee on organization see Exhibit A.)

"II. OFFICERS.

"The league has been officered from the beginning, both as to its national organization and as to its State and local branches, by the most prominent and high-minded men of the Nation—by men who not only have received no compensation but who have contributed largely both of their time and their means to carry through what they have conceived to be a necessary public service. The president of the league is ex-President William Howard Taft; its vice president, Alton B. Parker; the chairman of the executive committee, President A. Lawrence Lowell, of Harvard University. Its vice presidents include some 300 men of national reputation, and its national committee is composed of several hundred more of the outstanding leaders from such great national groups as organized labor, agriculture, chambers of commerce, women's clubs, and national industries. (For list of national officers see Exhibit B.)

"III. FINANCING.

"During the four years over which its activities have extended the league has raised (June 17, 1915–June 1, 1919) \$547,408.82 in general subscriptions and membership fees. The largest single subscription made to it by any individual has been \$25,000 and the next largest \$5,000. The approximate number of its subscriptions is 6,575, of which only 132 are \$1,000 or over; and the average subscription is \$83. Not a dollar of the income of the league has been derived from the Carnegie or Rockefeller Foundations. Its money, on the contrary, has been derived chiefly from people of moderate means who have believed that the establishment of the league of nations, by preventing future wars, would operate to the untold advantage of future generations and to the upbuilding of civilization. These funds have been contributed for the most part at the conventions of the league—in the organization meeting in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in June, 1915; in the Washington convention of the league in May, 1916; in the convention of the league in Philadelphia in May, 1918; and in connection with the

regional congresses held in nine of the leading cities of the Nation, stretching from coast to coast, in February, 1919.

"IV. USE OF LEAGUE FUNDS.

"Since its organization (June 17, 1915–June 1, 1919) the league has expended \$545,163.80, as follows:

1. Executive direction	\$44,048.93
2. Organization of branches	84,150.54
3. Office salaries, supplies, and operating expenses	89,767.30
4. National conventions	28,628.51
5. National congresses	99,395.67
6. State conventions	8,040.66
7. Publications	28,604.52
8. Publicity	51,530.46
9. Home extension	61,868.22
10. Foreign extension	5,070.56
11. Financial campaigns	20,713.27
12. Postage, not included in above classifications	28,345.26

"V. STATE AND COUNTY BRANCHES.

"There are active branches of the league in 26 State and in 520 counties and smaller political subdivisions. State, county, and local officers number approximately 2,281. Of these not more than 10, all of whom occupy minor positions, receive any salary whatsoever; the remainder contributing their time and influence, and often their means, to accomplish the purpose of the league. The following is a list of the more active State organizations and their chairmen.

"STATE CHAIRMEN.

- "Alabama: Michael Cody, Montgomery.
- "California: R. B. Hale, San Francisco.
- "Colorado: Hon. S. Harrison White, Denver.
- "Delaware: Hon. George Gray, Wilmington.
- "Illinois: Thomas F. Holgate, Chicago.
- "Iowa: George W. Clarke, Des Moines.
- "Kentucky: John W. Barr, Jr., Louisville.
- "Maryland: Hon. Edwin Warfield, Baltimore.
- "Massachusetts: Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell, Cambridge.
- "Missouri: Frederick N. Judson, St. Louis.
- "Nebraska: G. W. Wattles, Omaha.
- "New Hampshire: Huntley N. Spaulding, North Rochester.
- "New Jersey: Dr. Henry Van Dyke, Princeton.
- "New Mexico: Hon. Neill B. Field, Albuquerque.
- "New York: William Church Osborn, New York City.
- "Nevada: Hugh Henry Brown, Tonopah.
- "Ohio: Dr. W. O. Thompson, Columbus.
- "Wisconsin: Hon. John M. Whitehead, Janesville.
- "Oklahoma: Hon. C. B. Ames, Oklahoma City.
- "Rhode Island: Dr. William H. P. Faunce, Providence.
- "Tennessee: Robert T. Smith, Nashville.
- "Utah: Nephi L. Morris, Salt Lake City.
- "Virginia: George Bryan, Richmond.
- "Washington: N. B. Coffman, Chehalis.
- "West Virginia: Charles W. Dillon, Fayetteville.
- "Michigan: Woodbridge N. Ferris, Big Rapids.
- "Vermont: Roland E. Stevens, White River Junction.
- "Maine: Robert Treat Whitehouse, Portland.
- "Connecticut: Dr. William Arnold Shanklin, Middletown.
- "Indiana: Hon. Franklin McCray, Indianapolis.

"VI. SPEAKERS.

"The plan and arguments for a league of nations have been presented throughout the Nation before audiences of every character, by the type of volunteer speakers who performed such public-spirited service during the war. At the present time—June 1, 1919—approximately 13,000 speakers are enrolled and definitely pledged to the League to Enforce Peace as ready to give and as actually giving educational addresses on the subject of a league of nations. They represent the following major groups:

Labor	3,149
Agricultural interests	343
The church	3,000
Business and other groups	6,804

"These speakers work wholly without compensation, their expenses, with few exceptions, being paid either by themselves or by the organizations which they address. In order to meet emergencies a small number of staff speakers (never more than three at any time) have received modest salary or fees for addresses.

"VII. TYPE OF WORK CARRIED ON BY THE LEAGUE.

"The work of the League to Enforce Peace has been of an educational nature directed, first, toward the development throughout the country of an understanding of the general international situation as it will exist at the close of the war; second, toward an understanding of the main features of a league of nations which might create and maintain peace; and, third (since the publication of the league of nations covenant), to the giving of exact and detailed information regarding the league of nations covenant and its interpretation. The league has carried for-

ward a campaign of education covering questions of the war and kind of settlement necessary in order to secure permanent peace.

"VIII. OFFICIAL COMMITMENTS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

"That support of the project for a league of nations throughout the United States is not local or superficial in character and that it has not been merely improvised or induced by the activities of the League to Enforce Peace is apparent from the large number of National and State organizations that have committed themselves to the principle of a league of nations and in large part to the Paris covenant as now given to the world. Among such organizations are the following:

"A. The great church denominations of the country are, so far as known, committed without exception to the establishment of a league of nations. Some of the more conspicuous endorsements are as follows: General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, General Synod Evangelical Lutheran Churches in the United States of America, Religious Education Association, National Society of Christian Endeavor, Board of Bishops of the United Brethren in Christ, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

"B. Every representative organization of farmers and agricultural interests throughout the country is officially committed to the establishment of a league, including the National Board of Farm Organizations, the National Grange, the National Federation of Gleaners, the American Society of Equity, the Non-partisan League, the Southern Commercial Congress, the American Agricultural Association and the Farmers' National Council, and the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America.

"C. The American Federation of Labor pledged itself to the establishment of a league of nations as part of its reconstruction program in its annual convention of November, 1916, at Baltimore, Md., and has committed itself in all its succeeding annual conventions to this policy. The brotherhoods of railway employees in like manner stand pledged to a league. With the exception of the international socialists, American labor is believed to stand solidly in favor of a league and of the Paris covenant as the embodiment of the league for which they ask.

"D. The educational associations and the college and university faculties stand with practical unanimity in favor of a league of nations, as shown by official acts and commitments.

"E. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, by official referendum taken in November, 1915, stands committed by an overwhelming vote to the principle of a league of nations.

"F. Twenty-six State legislatures, by joint or concurrent resolutions, have, June 1, 1919, recorded themselves in favor of a league and only two against, as follows:

"For: Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Washington.

"Against: New Mexico, West Virginia.

"NOTE.—This list includes only those States in which both of the legislative branches have adopted the favorable or unfavorable resolution. There were also the following one-house resolutions; California, house for; Colorado, house for, senate against; Idaho, house against; Indiana, senate for.

"G. The organized women of the United States have adopted numerous resolutions indorsing the league, notably the following: The National American Woman's Suffrage Association; National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; General Federation of Women's Clubs (2,000,000 women); National Council of Women (composed of national organizations comprising 3,000,000 women); Council of Jewish Women; Dames of Malta; Woman's Auxiliary Southern Commercial Congress.

"H. Scores of national and State organizations of every character stand pledged to a league. (See Exhibit "C.")

"In a very large number of cases the organizations passing resolutions have also made use of their organizational machinery in various ways to spread information regarding a league and the Paris covenant and otherwise to forward the movement for a league."

"EXHIBIT A.

"NATIONAL PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A LEAGUE OF PEACE, BEING THE COMMITTEE THAT CALLED THE ORGANIZATION MEETING HELD IN INDEPENDENCE HALL, JUNE 17, 1915.

"Lyman Abbott, editor the Outlook.

"Edwin A. Alderman, president University of Virginia.

"James B. Angell, educator and diplomatist.

"Thomas Willing Balch, lawyer.

"John Barrett, director general Pan American Union.

"James M. Beck, former Assistant Attorney General.

"Alexander Graham Bell, scientist and inventor.

"Perry Belmont, former chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs.

"George H. Blakeslee, professor of history, Clark University.

"Rudolph Blankenburg, mayor of Philadelphia.

"Gutzon Borglum, sculptor.

"Samuel P. Brooks, president Baylor University.

"Charles R. Brown, dean Yale Divinity School.

"Elmer E. Brown, chancellor New York University.

"Henry A. Buchtel, ex-governor of Colorado.

"George Burnham, jr., publicist.

"Winston Churchill, author.

"Francis E. Clark, founder Christian Endeavor.

"John Bates Clark, political economist.

"Philander P. Claxton, United States Commissioner of Education.

"A. T. Clearwater, jurist.

"Frederic R. Coudert, lawyer.

"Frank Crane, editorial writer associated newspaper.

"R. Fulton Cutting, financier.

"William C. Dennis, formerly of State Department.

"Jacob M. Dickinson, ex-Secretary of War.

"Henry Sturgis Drinker, president Lehigh University.

"Samuel T. Dutton, educator.

"William H. P. Faunce, president Brown University.

"Woodbridge N. Ferris, governor of Michigan.

"John H. Finley, New York commissioner of education.

"Irving Fisher, political economist, Yale University.

"William Dudley Foulke, former member United States Civil Service Commission.

"Howard B. French, manufacturer.

"James Cardinal Gibbons.

"Franklin H. Giddings, sociologist.

"Washington Gladden, author, clergyman.

"William E. Glasscock, ex-governor West Virginia.

"Caspar F. Goodrich, rear admiral United States Navy.

"George Gray, member of Hague court.

"Herbert S. Hadley, ex-governor Missouri.

"John Hays Hammond, mining engineer.

"Albert Bushnell Hart, historian.

"William O. Hart, president Louisiana Historical Association.

"Rowland G. Hazard, manufacturer.

"Bayard Henry, lawyer.

"Myron T. Herrick, diplomatist.

"John Grier Hibben, president Princeton University.

"Emil G. Hirsch, rabbi.

"George C. Holt, United States district judge.

"Hamilton Holt, editor the Independent.

"H. J. Howland, associate editor The Independent.

"William B. Howland, president The Independent.

"Andrew B. Humphrey, secretary American Peace and Arbitration League.

"Charles Cheney Hyde, professor of international law, Northwestern University.

"J. E. Ingram, railway official.

"Jeremiah W. Jenks, political economist, New York University.

"Homer H. Johnson, lawyer.

"David Starr Jordan, scientist and educator.

"Frederick N. Judson, lawyer.

"Darwin P. Kingsley, president New York Life Insurance Co.

"J. Leonard Levy, rabbi.

"Edgar Odell Lovett, president Rice Institute.

"A. Lawrence Lowell, president Harvard University.

"Frederick Lynch, secretary Church Peace Union.

"Charles S. Macfarland, secretary Federal Council of Churches.

"Theodore Marburg, economist.

"Samuel W. McCall, Member of Congress.

"Victor H. Metcalf, Ex-Secretary of Navy.

"John Mitchell, chairman New York State Industrial Commission.

"Samuel C. Mitchell, president Delaware College.

"John Bassett Moore, professor international law and diplomacy, Columbia University.

"Henry C. Morris, president Chicago Peace Society.

"Cyrus Northrop, president emeritus University of Minnesota.

"Alton B. Parker, jurist.

"George A. Plimpton, publisher.

"George H. Prouty, ex-governor of Vermont.

"Odin Roberts, lawyer.

"Victor Rosewater, editor Omaha Bee.

"Leo S. Rowe, president American Academy Political and Social Science.

"Nath. C. Schaeffer, State superintendent public instruction.

"Jacob H. Schiff, banker.

"Isaac N. Seligman, banker.

"John C. Shaffer, newspaper publisher.

"William A. Shanklin, president Wesleyan University.

"Robert Sharp, president Tulane University.

"Albert Shaw, editor Review of Reviews.

"William H. Short, secretary the New York Peace Society.

"James L. Slayden, Ex-Member of Congress.

"Edgar F. Smith, provost University of Pennsylvania.

"John A. Stewart, chairman Peace Centennial Commission.

"Oscar S. Straus, member of Hague Court.

"Frank S. Streeter, lawyer.

"Joseph Swain, president Swarthmore College.

"William H. Taft, Ex-President United States.

"Charles T. Tatman, lawyer.

"John M. Thomas, president Middlebury College.

"William Hale Thompson, mayor of Chicago.

"Charles F. Thwing, president Western Reserve University.

"James L. Tryon, director American Peace Society.

"Henry St. George Tucker, lawyer.

"W. H. Vary, master New York State Grange.

"Anton C. Weiss, editor Duluth Herald.

"Benjamin Ide Wheeler, president University of California.

"Everett P. Wheeler, lawyer.

"Harry A. Wheeler, banker.

"Andrew D. White, educator and diplomatist.

"Thomas Raeburn White, lawyer.

"William Allen White, publicist.

"John M. Whitehead, lawyer.

"John Sharp Williams, United States Senator.

"Talcott Williams, journalist.

"Wardner Williams, president Colorado State Board of Peace Commissioners.

"George G. Wilson, professor of international law, Harvard University.

"Luther B. Wilson, bishop Methodist Episcopal Church.

"Oliver Wilson, master National Grange.

"Stephen S. Wise, rabbi.

"Theodore S. Woolsey, international law, Yale University."

"EXHIBIT B.

"COMMITTEEMEN OF LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE.

"ALABAMA.

"Executive committee: Michael Cody, Montgomery.

"National committee: Prof. C. L. Thatch, Auburn; Hon. Sidney J. Bowie, 831 First National Bank Building, Birmingham; Hon. John C. Anderson, Montgomery; William R. Fairley, 516 Balsom Avenue, Pratt City; Mrs. James Fullerton Hooper, Selma.

"Vice president: Hon. Charles Henderson, Troy.

"ARIZONA.

"Executive committee: Dr. Rufus B. von Kleinsmid, University of Arizona, Tucson.

"National committee: Mrs. H. D. Ross, 1219 North Central Avenue, Phoenix; E. P. Taylor, Tucson.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Thomas E. Campbell, Phoenix; Hon. George W. P. Hunt, Phoenix.

"ARKANSAS.

"Executive committee: Hon. Charles H. Brough, Little Rock.

"National committee: Herbert H. Bowden, Little Rock; Mrs. T. T. Cotnam, 427 Southern Trust Building, Little Rock; Frank Pace, Little Rock.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Clifton R. Breckinridge, Arkansas Valley Bank, Fort Smith; H. L. Rammel, Little Rock.

"CALIFORNIA.

"National committee: Dr. Thomas F. Hunt, University of California, Berkeley; Dr. Aurelia H. Reinhardt, Mills College; R. B. Hale, care of Hale Bros., San Francisco; Luther Burbank, 204 Santa Rosa Avenue, Santa Rosa.

"Vice Presidents: Hon. Victor H. Metcalf, 245 Perkins Street, Oakland; Hon. William D. Stephens, Sacramento; Hon. Lyman J. Gage, Point Loma, San Diego; Milton G. Esberg, San Francisco; W. W. Morrow, United States circuit court judge, San Francisco.

"COLORADO.

"Executive committee: Hon. S. Harrison White, chief justice Colorado Supreme Court, Denver.

"National committee: Clarence P. Dodge, Colorado Springs Gazette, Colorado Springs; Thomas B. Stearns, Denver; H. T. French, director of extension Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins; Mrs. H. W. Bennett, Littleton.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Julius C. Gunter, Denver; Right Rev. Francis J. McConnell, 964 Logan Street, Denver; Hon. Oliver H. Shoup, executive offices, Denver.

"CONNECTICUT.

"Executive committee: Col. Isaac M. Ullman, 84 Olive Street, New Haven.

"National committee: D. N. Barney, Farmington; Ira M. Coburn, secretary State Federation of Labor, 215 Meadow Street, New Haven; Prof. Irving Fisher, 460 Prospect Street, New Haven; Ernest Fox Nichols, Yale University, New Haven; Dr. Frank Chamberlin Porter, 266 Bradley Street, New Haven; George V. Smith, 246 Meadow Street, New Haven; Miss Dotha Stone Pinneo, Norwalk; Prof. Charles E. Wheeler, Storrs.

"Vice presidents: Right Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, 98 Woodland Street, Hartford; Hiram Percy Maxim, 550 Prospect Avenue, Hartford; Dr. Charles R. Brown, 233 Edwards Street, New Haven; Prof. Henry W. Farnam, 43 Hillhouse Avenue, New Haven; Prof. Theo. S. Woolsey, 250 Church Street, New Haven.

"DELAWARE.

"National committee: Mrs. H. B. Thompson, Greenville; Dean Harry Hayward, Delaware College, Newark; Dr. Samuel C. Mitchell, Delaware College, Newark; Fred W. Stierle, secretary Central Labor Union, Wilmington.

"Vice presidents: Hon. J. G. Townsend, jr., Dover; Hon. George Gray, 466 Dupont Block, Wilmington; Hon. Charles R. Miller, Wilmington.

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

"Executive committee: Hon. John Barrett, Director General Pan American Union, Washington; Samuel Gompers, American Federation of Labor, Washington; Hon. Vance C. McCormick, administrator Board Exports Council, Washington; Mrs. Philip North Moore, Wardman Park Inn, Washington; Prof. Leo S. Rowe, Assistant Secretary of Treasury, Washington; Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, 1626 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington; Hon. William Howard Taft, 931 Southern Building, Washington; Hon. C. B. Ames, Assistant to the Attorney General, Washington.

"National committee: Hon. Larz Anderson, 2118 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington; Mrs. Antoinette Funk, Treasury Department, Washington; Hon. Martin A. Knapp, United States Commerce Court, Washington; Maj. E. J. W. Proffitt, care Metropolitan Club, Washington; Monsignor William T. Russell, St. Patrick's Rectory, Washington; Col. William C. Sanger, 930 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington; C. W. Thompson, Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture, Washington.

"Vice presidents: Alexander Graham Bell, 1331 Connecticut Avenue, Washington; Miss Mabel T. Boardman, 1801 P Street, Washington; Dr. Edward D. Eaton, 3313 Ross Place, Washington; Mrs. Borden Harriman, 1709 H Street, Washington; Hon. H. D. Lindsley, War Risk Insurance Bureau, Treasury Department, Washington; Harry A. Wheeler, Riggs Building, Washington.

"FLORIDA.

"Executive committee: Hon. William R. O'Neal, 115 South Orange Avenue, Orlando.

"National committee: Dr. P. H. Rolfs, University of Florida, Gainesville; F. C. Groover, Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville; Mrs. William B. Young, Jacksonville; William V. McNeir, box 1022, Pensacola; Hon. W. N. Sheats, 185 North Monroe Street, Tallahassee.

"Vice president: Hon. Sidney J. Catts, Tallahassee.

"GEORGIA.

"Executive committee: Hon. Asa G. Candler, Atlanta.

"National committee: Ivan E. Allen, Fielder & Allen Building, Atlanta; Henry M. Atkinson, Georgia Railroad & Power Co., Atlanta; Jerome Jones, 304 Hurt Building, Atlanta; Mrs. J. R. Lamar, 35 West Eleventh Street, Atlanta; H. E. Stockbridge, Southern Ruralist, Atlanta.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Hugh M. Dorsey, Atlanta; Hon. John M. Slaton, Atlanta; Mell R. Wilkinson, Candler Building, Atlanta; Hon. Peter W. Meldrin, 1007 National Bank Building, Savannah; C. S. Barrett, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Union City.

"IDAHO.

"Executive committee: Hon. James H. Hawley, 610 Overland Building, Boise.

"National committee: S. B. Hayes, Boise; W. W. Deal, master of the Idaho State Grange, Nampa.

"ILLINOIS.

"Executive committee: Edgar A. Bancroft, 606 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago.

"National committee: Hon. William B. McKinley, Campaign; Mrs. Joseph T. Bowen, department of State organization, Chicago; Charles L. Dering, 1005 Old Colony Building,

Chicago; Dr. Shailer Mathews, University of Chicago, Chicago; Hon. Henry C. Morris, 140 South Dearborn Street, Chicago; John C. Shaffer, 125 Market Street, Chicago; Prof. Lorado Taft, 6016 Ellis Avenue, Chicago; Charles P. Ford, international secretary International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Springfield; Dr. Eugene Davenport, dean agricultural college, Urbana.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Edward O. Brown, 1216 North State Street, Chicago; Hon. Jacob M. Dickinson, 800 The Temple, Chicago; Cyrus H. McCormick, 606 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago; Hon. Martin B. Madden, 3829 Michigan Avenue, Chicago; Harry H. Merrick, 125 West Monroe Street, Chicago; Mrs. John J. Mitchell, 1550 North State Street, Chicago; La Verne W. Noyes, 1146 South Campbell Avenue, Chicago; Harry A. Wheeler, Union Trust Co., Chicago (also in Washington, D. C.); Hon. Oliver Wilson, 214 Callender Street, Peoria.

"INDIANA.

"Executive committee: Hon. William D. Foulke, Richmond.

"National committee: Frank Duffey, general secretary United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Carpenters' Building, Indianapolis; Hon. J. Frank Hanly, 707 I. O. O. F. Building, Indianapolis; Mrs. Grace Julian Clarke, Irvington; Hon. Edgar D. Crumpacker, 208 Michigan Street, Valparaiso; E. B. Moore, Circleville.

"Vice presidents: Will H. Hays, Republican national committee, Indianapolis; John H. Holliday, Union Trust Co., Indianapolis.

"IOWA.

"Executive committee: E. T. Meredith, Successful Farming, Des Moines.

"National committee: F. A. Canfield, Cedar Rapids; Miss Alice French, Davenport; Dr. John H. T. Main, Grinnell College, Grinnell; James M. Pierce, president Pierce's Farm Weeklies, Des Moines.

"Vice presidents: Hon. W. L. Harding, Des Moines; Hon. Lafayette Young, sr., Des Moines; Hon. M. J. Wade, Iowa City.

"KANSAS.

"Executive committee: Hon. Arthur Capper, 1031 Topeka Avenue, Topeka; Foster Dwight Coburn, 424 Topeka Avenue, Topeka.

"National committee: Dr. Frank Strong, University of Kansas, Lawrence; Alexander Howat, president United Mine Workers of America, Pittsburg; Hon. Stephen H. Allen, Topeka; Mrs. H. O. Garvey, 515 Buchanan Street, Topeka; J. C. Mohler, secretary State Board of Agriculture, Topeka.

"Vice presidents: William Allen White, Emporia; Hon. Charles F. Scott, Iola; W. R. Stubbs, Lawrence; Hon. Henry J. Allen, executive offices, Topeka; Frank P. MacLennan, State Journal, Topeka.

"KENTUCKY.

"National committee: T. R. Bryant, assistant director of extension Agricultural College, University of Kentucky, Lexington; Mrs. Thomas Jefferson Smith, 1420 St. James Court, Louisville.

"Vice presidents: Hon. A. O. Stanley, Frankfort; Henry Waterson, Louisville.

"LOUISIANA.

"National committee: A. T. Prescott, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge; James M. Thomson, New Orleans Item, New Orleans; T. J. Greer, president State Federation of Labor, Shreveport.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Ruffin G. Pleasant, Baton Rouge; Dr. Paul H. Saunders, New Orleans.

"MAINE.

"National committee: H. B. Brawn, secretary State Federation of Labor, Augusta; Mrs. John F. Hill, Augusta; Leon S. Merrill, College of Agriculture, Orono; W. P. Thompson, South China.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Carl Milliken, Augusta; William T. Cobb, Bath Iron Works (Ltd.), Bath.

"MARYLAND.

"Executive committee: William F. Cochran, 1531 Munsey Building, Baltimore; Hon. Theodore Marburg, 14 Mount Vernon Place, West Baltimore.

"National committee: Mrs. Edward Shoemaker, 1031 North Calvert Street, Baltimore; Francis A. White, Keyser Building, Baltimore; Henry W. Williams, Fidelity Building, Baltimore; H. J. Patterson, College Park.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Emerson C. Harrington, Annapolis; Bernard N. Baker, 905 Calvert Building, Baltimore; His Eminence J. Cardinal Gibbons, 408 North Charles Street, Baltimore; Miss Kate M. McLane, 211 West Monument Street, Baltimore.

"MASSACHUSETTS.

"Executive committee: Edward A. Filene, 426 Washington Street, Boston; A. Lawrence Lowell, Harvard University, Cambridge; James Duncan, Hancock Building, Quincy; Dr. Harry A. Garfield, Williams College, Williamstown.

"National committee: Kenyon L. Butterfield, Amherst; Ralph W. Redman, Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst; Henry Abrahams, 11 Appleton Street, Boston; Hon. James Mott Hallowell, Pemberton Building, Boston; Rev. Hubert C. Herring, 14 Beaver Street, Boston; Prof. George H. Blakeslee, Clark University, Worcester.

"Vice presidents: Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews, 405 Marlborough Street, Boston; Dr. E. Francis Clarke, 31 Mount Vernon Street, Boston; Henry L. Higginson, 191 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston; Charles C. Jackson, 462 Beacon Street, Boston; Right Rev. William Lawrence, 122 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston; Hon. Samuel W. McCall, 68 Devonshire Street, Boston; Rev. Edward Cummings, 104 Irvington Street, Cambridge; Prof. Francis G. Peabody, 13 Kirkland Street, Cambridge; William Roscoe Thayer, 8 Berkeley Street, Cambridge; Prof. George G. Wilson, Harvard University, Cambridge; Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes, 280 Adams Street, Milton; Miss Mary E. Woolley, Holyoke College, South Hadley.

"MICHIGAN.

"Executive committee: E. B. Caultkins, Michigan Steel Casting Co., Detroit.

"National committee: Dr. Harry B. Hutchins, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Mrs. Carolina Bartlett Crane, Kalamazoo; Right Rev. Charles D. Williams, St. Paul's Cathedral, Detroit; Prof. E. H. Ryder, Agricultural College, department of history, East Lansing.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Woodbridge N. Ferris, 515 Elm Street, Big Rapids; John W. Blodgett, Grand Rapids; Hon. H. A. Sleeper, Lansing.

"MINNESOTA.

"Executive committee: E. J. Couper, care of Northwestern Knitting Mills Co., Minneapolis; Dr. Donald J. Cowling, Carlton College, Northfield.

"National committee: Mrs. J. L. Washburn, Duluth; Dr. Marion L. Burton, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Hon. Adolph O. Eberhardt, Title Holding & Mortgage Co., Metropolitan Bank Building, Minneapolis; George W. Lawson, secretary State Federation of Labor, 75 West Seventh Street, St. Paul; Prof. A. D. Wilson, director of Extension and Farmers' Institutes, University Farm, St. Paul.

"Vice Presidents: Dr. Cyrus Northrup, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Hon. J. A. A. Burnquist, St. Paul.

"MISSISSIPPI.

"Executive committee: J. T. Thomas, care of Bank of Grenada, Grenada.

"National committee: Dr. G. R. Hightower, Agricultural College; Prof. F. P. Gaines, Agricultural College; Miss Belle Kearney, Flora; Mrs. Daisy McL. Stevens, Hattiesburg.

"Vice presidents: Hon. John Sharp Williams, Benton; Hon. Leroy Percy, Greenville.

"MISSOURI.

"Executive committee: William T. Kemper, Southwest National Bank of Commerce, Kansas City; Frederick N. Judson, 1326 Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis.

"National committee: Henry M. Beardsley, Kansas City; Chester H. Gray, president Missouri Farm Bureau Association, Nevada; George Warren Brown, Advertising Building, St. Louis; Mrs. Benjamin F. Bush, 5334 Waterman Avenue, St. Louis; Prof. Roland G. Usher, 5737 Gates Avenue, St. Louis.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Frederick D. Gardner, Jefferson; Benjamin F. Bush, St. Louis; Clarence H. Howard, Commonwealth Steel Co., St. Louis; Wallace Simmons, Simmons Hardware Co., St. Louis; Melville L. Wilkinson, St. Louis.

"MONTANA.

"National committee: F. S. Cooley, director of extension, Montana State College, Bozeman; M. M. Donoghue, 531 Diamond Street, Butte.

"Vice president: Hon. Samuel V. Stewart, Helena.

"NEBRASKA.

"National committee: Mrs. Althera H. Letton, 1910 E Street, Lincoln; W. A. Fraser, W. O. W. Building, Omaha; Victor Rosewater, Omaha.

"Vice presidents: Hon. S. R. McKelvie, Executive Offices, Lincoln; Hon. Keith Neville, Lincoln, Nebr.

"NEVADA.

"Executive committee: Hugh H. Brown, State Banking & Trust Co. Building, Tonopah.

"National committee: Charles A. Norcross, director of extension, University of Nevada, Reno; Frank W. Ingram, chairman State legislative board B. L. F. and E., Sparks.

"Vice president: Hon. Emmet B. Boyle, Carson City.

"NEW HAMPSHIRE.

"Executive committee: Gen. Frank S. Streeter, Concord.

"National committee: R. D. Hetzel, president New Hampshire College, Durham; Mrs. Alpha H. Harriman, 778 Main Street, Laconia; Winston Churchill, Cornish.

"Vice presidents: Hon. John H. Bartlett, Executive Offices, Concord; Hon. Henry W. Keyes, Concord.

"NEW JERSEY.

"Executive committee: George Munro Forrest, Ingersoll-Rand Co., Phillipsburg; Hon. Henry Van Dyke Avalon, Princeton; Thomas N. McCarter, 80 Park Place, Newark.

"National committee: Hon. Harold B. Wells, Bordentown; George L. Record, Commercial Trust Building, Jersey City; Harold J. Howland, Montclair; Henry F. Hilfers, 68 South Orange Avenue, Newark; L. A. Clinton, director of extension, Agricultural College, New Brunswick; Mrs. Charles W. Stockton, Karamus Road, Ridgewood.

"Vice presidents: Hon. John Franklin Fort, Essex Building, Newark; President John Grier Hibben, Princeton University, Princeton; Hon. Walter E. Edge, Trenton.

"NEW MEXICO.

"Executive committee: Hon. Neill B. Field, New Arriyo Building, Albuquerque.

"National committee: Mrs. C. E. Mason, Roswell; A. C. Cooley, State College.

"Vice president: Hon. P. A. Larrazolo, Executive Offices, Santa Fe.

"NEW YORK.

"Executive committee: Prof. John Bates Clark, 407 West One hundred and seventeenth Street, New York City; Charles Stewart Davison, 60 Wall Street, New York City; Glenn Frank, Century Magazine, 353 Fourth Avenue, New York City; Hamilton Holt, 119 West Fortieth Street, New York City; Herbert S. Houston, 116 West Thirty-second Street, New York City; Hon. Henry C. Ide, 128 West Fifty-ninth Street, New York City; Sam A. Lewisohn, 61 Broadway, New York City; Dr. Frederick Lynch, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City; Hon. William G. McAdoo, 120 Broadway, New York City; John Mitchell, 230 Fifth Avenue, New York City; Hon. Alton B. Parker, 111 Broadway, New York City; Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr., Debarcation Hospital No. 5, Lexington Avenue and Forty-sixth Street, New York City; William L. Saunders, 11 Broadway, New York City; Dr. William Jay Schieffelin, 170 William Street, New York City; Finley J. Shepard, 120 Broadway, New York City; William H. Short, 130 West Forty-second Street, New York City; Franz Sigel, 897 Crotona Park, North, New York City; Dr. William F. Slocum, 130 West Forty-second Street, New York City; Hon. Oscar S. Straus, 46 Warren Street, New York City; Henry W. Taft, 40 Wall Street, New York City; Hon. William H. Wadham, 32 Franklin Street, New York City; Hon. Frank P. Walsh, Room 2146 Woolworth Building, New York City; Charles S. Ward, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York City; Hon. George W. Wickersham, 40 Wall Street, New York City; Dr. Talcott Williams, Columbia University, New York City; Hon. Marton T. Manton, judge, United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Post Office Building, New York City.

"National committee: Dean A. R. Mann, Agricultural College, Ithaca; Miss Helen V. Boswell, 521 West One hundred and eleventh Street, New York City; Peter J. Brady, Room 812, Municipal Building, New York City; Hon. Job E. Hedges, 163 Broadway, New York City; Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, 124 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York City (home address, 2606 Whitis Avenue, Austin, Tex.); William M. Sloane, 163 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York City; Nelson S. Spencer, 27 William Street, New York City; Dr. George E. Vincent, 61 Broadway, New York City; Richard B. Watrous, Nestle's Food Co. (Inc.), 130-134 William Street, New York City; Miss Maude Wetmore, 257 Madison Avenue, New York City; Dr. Henry Noble MacCracken, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie; Hon. Michael E. Driscoll, 218 Green Street, Syracuse.

"Vice presidents: Dr. John H. Finley, department of education, Albany; Hon. Charles S. Whitman, Albany; Dr. Nehemiah Boynton, 379 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Hon. Ansley Wilcox, 641 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo; Daniel Smiley, Lake Mohonk; Dr. Lyman Abbott, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York City; Dr. Arthur J. Brown, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City; Hon. Theodore E. Burton, 42 Wall Street, New York City; Irving T. Bush, 130 West Forty-second Street, New York City; R. Fulton Cutting, 32 Nassau Street, New York City; Hon. James W. Gerard, 46 Cedar Street, New York City; Dr. Vir-

ginia C. Gildersleeve, Barnard College, New York City; John Hays Hammond, 120 Broadway, New York City; Hon. George C. Holt, 233 Broadway, New York City; Hon. Charles E. Hughes, 96 Broadway, New York City; Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, 121 West Eighty-fifth Street, New York City; Robert U. Johnson, 347 Madison Avenue, New York City; Darwin P. Kingsley, 346 Broadway, New York City; Howard Mansfield, 49 Wall Street, New York City; Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Forty-second Street Building, New York City; Dr. Frank Mason North, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City; George A. Plimpton, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City; Jacob H. Schiff, 52 William Street, New York City; Right Rev. Luther B. Wilson, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City; Dr. Stephen S. Wise, 23 West Ninetieth Street, New York City.

"NORTH CAROLINA.

"Executive committee: Hon. Thomas W. Bickett, Raleigh; Clarence Poe, Raleigh.

"National committee: James F. Barrett, Asheville; Dr. E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Mrs. Aubrey L. Brooks, Greensboro; Dr. L. L. Hobbs, Guilford College; C. Hanford Henderson, Samarcand.

"Vice president: J. R. Kenly, Wilmington.

"NORTH DAKOTA.

"National committee: Dr. E. F. Ladd, Agricultural College; Hon. Louis B. Hanna, Fargo; Mrs. Frank White, 209 West Park Avenue, Valley City.

"Vice president: Hon. A. A. Bruce, chief justice supreme court, Bismarck; Hon. Lynn J. Frazier, Bismarck.

"OHIO.

"Executive committee: John P. Frey, International Molders' Journal, Commercial-Tribune Building, Cincinnati; Louis J. Alber, 2443 Prospect Avenue, Cleveland; Homer H. Johnson, American Trust Building, Cleveland; Warren S. Stope, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1116 Engineers Building, Cleveland; Arthur E. Morgan, Conservancy Building, Dayton.

"National committee: Hon. Chas. H. Grosvenor, Athens; J. F. Cunningham, Cleveland; Mrs. Preston E. Rood, 738 Grove Place, Toledo; Joseph G. Butler, jr., post-office box 308, Youngstown.

"Vice president: Hon. J. G. Schmidlapp, Union Savings Bank and Trust Building, Cincinnati; Hon. Myron T. Herrick, Cleveland; Hon. James M. Cox, Columbus; Dr. Henry C. King, Oberlin.

"OKLAHOMA.

"Executive committee: Hon. C. B. Ames (see District of Columbia).

"National committee: Hon. C. O. Blake, El Reno; Edgar Fenton, president State Federation of Labor, 515 Baltimore Building, Oklahoma City; G. G. Sohlberg, Oklahoma City; Mrs. H. Coulter Todd, Oklahoma City; James A. Wilson, College of Agriculture, Stillwater.

"Vice presidents: Hon. R. L. Williams, Oklahoma City; James J. McGraw, Ponca City.

"OREGON.

"National committee: W. J. Kerr, president Agricultural College, Corvallis; Gen. Charles F. Beebe, Portland; C. S. Jackson, Portland; Mrs. J. B. Montgomery, Portland.

"Vice presidents: Hon. James Withycombe, Salem; Henry L. Corbett, Portland.

"PENNSYLVANIA.

"Executive committee: Dr. M. Carey Thomas, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr; Hon. Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg (mail address, Washington, D. C.); George Burnham, jr., 1421 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia; Philip H. Gadsden, 1401 Arch Street, Box 1902, Philadelphia (home address, Charleston, S. C.); John A. Voll, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada, Colonial Trust Co. Building, Philadelphia; Maj. Fred J. Miller, Center Bridge.

"National committee: Mrs. Edward W. Biddle, Carlisle; Bayard Henry, 1438 Land Title Building, Philadelphia; M. S. McDowell, director of extension, State College of Agriculture, State College; Joseph Swain, Swarthmore College.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Martin G. Brumbaugh, Harrisburg; Right Rev. James H. Darlington, 321 North Front Street, Harrisburg; Edward Bok, Merion-on-the-Main Line, Philadelphia; Miss Mary A. Burnham, 3401 Powelton Avenue, Philadelphia; Hon. John Cadwalader, 263 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia; Cyrus H. K. Curtis, Philadelphia; George H. Lorimer, Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia; Francis Rawle, West End Trust Building, Philadelphia; Frederic H. Strawbridge, 801 Market Street, Philadelphia; Dr. Samuel B. McCormick, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh; Benjamin Thaw, 316 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh.

"RHODE ISLAND.

"Executive committee: Hon. Charles D. Kimball, 459 Washington Street, Providence.

"National committee: Mrs. George H. Fowler, 72 Mineral Spring Avenue, Pawtucket; John P. Farnsworth, Providence; Lawrence A. Grace, secretary State Federation of Labor, 268 Weybasset Street, Providence; Hon. J. J. Dunn, secretary of State board of agriculture, Providence.

"Vice president: Hon. R. Livingston Beekman, Providence.

"SOUTH CAROLINA.

"Executive committee: Philip H. Gadsden, Charleston (mail address, Philadelphia, Pa.).

"National committee: Dr. Josiah Morse, University of South Carolina, Columbia; Hon. Martin F. Ansel, Greenville.

"Vice presidents: R. Goodwyn Rhett, Charleston; Hon. Richard I. Manning, Sumter.

"SOUTH DAKOTA.

"National committee: W. C. Allen, Aberdeen; Mrs. Fred H. Hollister, Sioux Falls.

"Vice president: Hon. Peter Norbeck, Pierre.

"TENNESSEE.

"Executive committee: Bolton Smith, 66 Madison Avenue, Memphis; Dr. Bruce R. Payne, George Peabody College, Nashville.

"National committee: Dr. H. A. Morgan, Knoxville; Hon. Charles N. Burch, 1006 Exchange Building, Memphis; Hon. Ben W. Hooper, Newport.

"Vice presidents: Right Rev. Thomas F. Gallor, Memphis; Dr. J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville.

"TEXAS.

"Executive committee: Sam P. Cochran, 1821 Young Street, Dallas.

"National committee: Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, 2606 Whitis Avenue, Austin (mail address: New York City); W. B. Bizzell, president Agricultural College, College Station; Will T. Henry, Dallas; Prof. H. M. Colvin, El Paso; M. F. Barnett, 712 Hemphill Street, Fort Worth; Hon. W. C. Wear, Hillsboro.

"Vice presidents: Hon. William P. Hobby, Austin; Dr. Edgar Odell Lovett, Rice Institute, Houston; Col. H. F. MacGregor, Houston; T. J. Record, The City National Bank, Paris; Pat M. Neff, Waco.

"UTAH.

"National committee: F. S. Harris, director of extension, Utah Agricultural College, Logan; W. M. Piggott, Box 488, Ogden; Mrs. A. M. Horne, Salt Lake City.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Alfred W. Agee, Ogden; Hon. Simon Bamberger, Salt Lake City; John C. Cutler, Salt Lake City.

"VERMONT.

"National committee: F. L. Houghton, Brattleboro; Ralph E. Flanders, Springfield.

"Vice presidents: Hon. Horace F. Graham, Montpelier; Hon. George H. Prouty, Newport.

"VIRGINIA.

"Executive committee: Hon. Henry St. G. Tucker, Lexington; John Stewart Bryan, News-Leader, Richmond.

"National committee: Mrs. Kate W. Barrett, Alexandria; Jesse M. Jones, director of extension, Agricultural College, Blacksburg; Dr. James H. Dillard, Charlottesville; Hon. C. G. Kizer, Industrial Commission of Virginia, Richmond.

"Vice presidents: Dr. Edward A. Alderman, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; Hon. William H. Mann, Petersburg.

"WASHINGTON.

"Executive committee: Hon. Ernest Lister, Olympia.

"National committee: W. S. Thornber, director of agricultural extension, Pullman; Dr. Henry Suzzalo, University of Washington, Seattle; William H. Cowles, 2602 West Second Avenue, Spokane; Mrs. Overton G. Ellis, 811 North G Street, Tacoma.

"Vice president: J. E. Chilberg, Scandinavian American Bank, Seattle.

"WEST VIRGINIA.

"Executive committee: J. B. Finley, 1117 Juliana Street, Parkersburg.

"National committee: Thomas C. Atkeson, Buffalo; V. L. Highland, Clarksburg; Mrs. John H. Ruhl, Clarksburg; W. B. Hilton, editor Wheeling Majority, Wheeling.

"Vice president: Hon. John L. Cornwell, Charleston.

"WISCONSIN.

"Executive committee: Dean H. L. Russell, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Edward W. Frost, 1201 Wells Building, Milwaukee; Hon. John M. Whitehead, Janesville.

National committee: Dr. Samuel Plantz, Appleton; C. J. Galpin, College of Agriculture, Madison; Mrs. George H. Noyes, 204 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee; Andrew J. Frame, Waukesha.

"Vice president: Hon. E. L. Philipp, Executive Offices, Madison; Hon. John B. Winslow, 131 Langdon Street, Madison.

"WYOMING.

"National committee: Mrs. L. C. Harnsberger, Lander; Hon. V. H. Stone, Lander; Prof. Harvey L. Eby, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

"Vice president: Hon. Robert D. Carey, Cheyenne; Hon. Frank L. Houx, Cheyenne."

"EXHIBIT C.

"A PARTIAL LIST OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE INDORSED LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

"National Association of Post Office Laborers. Mr. Conrad Kessler, 423 West Forty-ninth Street, New York City.

"Disciples of Christ. Rev. Edgar Dewitt Jones, 8 Whites Place, Bloomington, Ill.

"National American Woman Suffrage Association. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, 171 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

"Church Peace Union. Dr. Frederick Lynch, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

"American Agricultural Association. Mr. G. W. Stearn, 1125 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

"American Federation of Labor. Mr. Samuel Gompers, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C.

"American Manufacturers' Export Association. Mr. E. V. Douglass, 160 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

"Associated Advertising Clubs of the World. Mr. William C. D'Arcy, International Life Building, St. Louis, Mo.

"United States Chamber of Commerce (referendum No. 11). Mr. Harry A. Wheeler (November, 1915), 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

"United Brethren in Christ Board of Bishops. Bishop William M. Bell, 1450 Fairmont Street NW., Washington, D. C.

"World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship. Rev. William P. Merrill, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

"Council of Jewish Women. Mrs. Nathaniel E. Harris, 114 South Avenue, Bradford, Pa.

"Dames of Malta. Mr. John H. Larson, 1345 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

"National Society Daughters of American Revolution. Mrs. George Thatcher Guernsey, The Rochambeau, Washington, D. C.

"Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America. Mr. Charles S. Barrett, Union City, Ga.

"Farmers' National Reconstruction Conference, Washington, D. C.

"Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Rev. Frank Mason North, 612 Charities Building, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York City.

"Evangelical Lutheran Church in United States of America. Rev. Victor G. A. Tressler, 515 North Fountain Avenue, Springfield, Ohio.

"National Board of Farm Organizations. Charles A. Lyman, secretary, 615 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

"The Gideons. Mr. Harry J. Humphreys, 2474 Third Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.

"Grand Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles. J. S. Parry, Esq., Buffalo, N. Y.

"Grand Chamber Order Knights of Friendship. Mr. Samuel P. Faust, 618 Washington Street, Reading, Pa.

"National Reform Association. Dr. Henry Collin Minton, 440 Bellevue Avenue, Trenton, N. J.

"International Order of the King's Daughters and Sons. Mrs. A. H. Evans, 336 West Eighty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.

"Grand Lodge Independent Order of Daughters of St. George. Mrs. Elizabeth Tennant, 12 Elsmere Avenue, Methuen, Mass.

"International Railway General Foremen's Association. Mr. L. A. North, 1518 Seventy-sixth Place, Chicago, Ill.

"Military Order of Foreign Wars of the United States, National Commandery. Brig. Gen. Samuel W. Fountain, Room A, Bellevue-Stratford, Devon, Pa.

"National Association of Brass Manufacturers. Mr. William W. Webster, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

"National Association of Builders' Exchange. Col. John R. Wiggins, Philadelphia, Pa.

"National Association Merchant Tailors of America. Mr. Albert Mathews, 27 East Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

"National Council of Women. Mrs. Philip North Moore, 3125 Lafayette Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

"National Economic League. Mr. J. W. Beatson, 6 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

"Department of superintendence, National Education Association of the United States. Prof. George D. Strayer, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

"National Federation of Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association. Mr. C. M. Johnson, Rush City, Minn.

"The National Grange. Mr. Oliver Wilson, Peoria, Ill.

"The National Party. Mr. Allen McCurdy, 15 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

"National Retail Dry Goods Association. Mr. Francis Kilduff, 33 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

"New England Hardware Dealers' Association. Mr. George A. Fiel, 10 High Street, Boston, Mass.

"Pan American Labor Conference, Laredo, Tex. Mr. Samuel Gompers, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C.

"Shepherds of America, supreme sanctuary. Mr. Archie L. Wicks, 26 Wiggins Avenue, Patchogue, N. Y.

"American Friends of German Democracy. Mr. Franz Sigel, 6 West Forty-eighth Street, New York, N. Y.

"Farmers' Equity Union. Mr. P. L. Betts, Chicago, Ill.

"Southern Commercial Congress. Mr. William H. Saunders, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets, Washington, D. C.

"Southwestern Shoe Travelers' Association. Mr. B. M. McWhirter, box 1102, Waco, Tex.

"North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Mr. George Buck, Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, Ind.

"Synod of the Province of New England, representing Episcopal churches of New England. Rev. Ernest J. Dennen, 1 Joy Street, Boston, Mass.

"National Society Christian Endeavor. Rev. Francis E. Clark, LL. D., Mount Vernon and Joy Streets, Boston, Mass.

"American Insurance Union. Dr. George W. Hogland, A. I. U. Building, Columbus, Ohio.

"Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration. Mrs. Daniel Smiley, Mohonk Lake, Ulster County, N. Y.

"Religious Education Association. Rev. Henry F. Cope, 1440 East Fifty-seventh Street, Chicago, Ill.

"Woman's Auxiliary Southern Commercial Congress. Miss Louise Lindsley, Nashville, Tenn.

"General Federation of Women's Clubs, representing 2,000,000.

"Victory Committee of Women, composed of heads of all organizations who did active war work, such as councils of national defense, National League for Woman's Service, etc.

"Indian Rights Association. M. K. Sniffen, 995 Drexel Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

"Midyear Conference of Home Missions Secretaries of the Disciples of Christ.

"Mid-European Union, October, 1918.

"General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, representing 1,600,000 members.

"Children of American Loyalty League. Mrs. Nat. S. Brown, 320 Boatmans Bank Building, St. Louis, Mo.

"Northern Baptist convention, representing 1,500,000."

"A PARTIAL LIST OF STATE ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE INDORSED LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

"Alabama State Bar Association.

"Arkansas Sunday School Association.

"High School Principals Convention, California.

"California Federation of Women's Clubs, northern district.

"California Sunday School Association.

"The California Branch of the League to Enforce Peace.

"The California Society Dames of the Loyal Legion.

"California Rural State Letter Carriers' Association.

"Northern California Hotel Association.

"Modern Language Association of Southern California.

"The Great Council of Colorado, Improved Order of Red Men.

"Federation of Labor of Colorado.

"Connecticut State Association of Letter Carriers.

"Order of the Eastern Star, Connecticut.

"Past Exalted Rulers Association, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Connecticut.

"Petition signed by faculty and students of the Women's College of Delaware.

"National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Florida Branch.

"Florida Division United Daughters of the Confederacy.

"Florida Bankers Association.

"Florida Federation of Women's Clubs.

"Florida Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

"Alumnae Association Illinois Training School for Nurses.

"Twelfth District Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs.

"Illinois Lumber and Builders Supply Dealers' Association.

"State Conference of County Agents, Iowa.

"Iowa Conference Daughters of the American Revolution.
 "State Grange, Iowa.
 "Royal Neighbors of America, Kansas.
 "Kansas Division Farmers' Education and Cooperative Union of America.
 "Kansas State Live-Stock Association.
 "Farmers' National Congress for Kentucky.
 "Kentucky Purebred Live-Stock Association.
 "Executive board Kentucky State Federation of Labor.
 "Maine State Board of Trade.
 "State Federation of Labor, Maine—1917 and 1918.
 "Maine State Grange.
 "Massachusetts State Society Daughters of the American Revolution.
 "Rebekah Assembly, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Michigan.
 "Michigan State Association of Letter Carriers.
 "Rural Life Conference Central Michigan Normal School.
 "Mississippi Sunday School Association.
 "Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs.
 "Farmers' National Congress of the State of Missouri.
 "The Nebraska Retail Hardware Association.
 "Nebraska State Grange.
 "New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs.
 "State Department of Agriculture and Merrimack County Farm Bureau, New Hampshire.
 "New Hampshire Manufacturers' Association.
 "New Hampshire Bankers' Association banquet.
 "New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs.
 "Grand Castle of New Jersey, Knights of the Golden Eagle.
 "New Jersey Woman Suffrage Association.
 "Fifth Annual Synod of Episcopal Bishops, Clergy and Laymen of the Province of New York and New Jersey.
 "New York Peace Society.
 "New York Fraternal Congress.
 "Retail Lumber Dealers' Association, New York.
 "New York State Grangers.
 "Daughters of the Revolution, State of New York.
 "New York State Federation Women's Clubs.
 "North Carolina Conference for Social Service.
 "North Carolina Farmers' State Convention.
 "North Carolina Educational Association.
 "North Dakota Grangers.
 "Master House Painters and Decorators' Association, Ohio.
 "Ohio Retail Furniture Dealers' Association.
 "Women of the Northwest through the Woman's Bureau of Social Equity of the Council of Women Voters, Oregon.
 "Convention, Diocesan Protestant Episcopal Church, Pennsylvania.
 "Pennsylvania Council National Defense.
 "Pennsylvania State Grange.
 "Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Rhode Island.
 "Rhode Island Woman Suffrage Party.
 "Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Rhode Island.
 "Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs.
 "Rhode Island Branch, National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Association.
 "The Maccabees, Rhode Island.
 "Rhode Island Equal Suffrage Association.
 "Grand Commandery, Knights Templar of South Carolina.
 "Woman's Missionary Council of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Tennessee.
 "National League for Woman's Service, Tennessee.
 "Daughters of the American Revolution, Texas.
 "Texas Federation of Women's Clubs.
 "The Texas State Dental Society.
 "Texas Library and Historical Commission.
 "State Rebekah Assembly, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Texas.
 "Vermont State Federation of Women's Clubs.
 "Grand Council Order Fraternal Americans, Virginia.
 "Wisconsin Association of Optometrists.
 "Dairymen's Association, Wisconsin.
 "Wisconsin Electrical Association.
 "Wisconsin Gas Association.
 "Grand Lodge of Wisconsin, International Order of Good Templars.
 "International Order of the King's Daughters and Sons, Wisconsin Branch.
 "National League for Woman's Service, Wisconsin.
 "Directors of the Woman's Synodical Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church in Wisconsin.
 "Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association.
 "Wisconsin Sheet Metal Contractors' Association.
 "Wisconsin State Bottlers' Association."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, before I take my seat I desire to refer also to the statement made by the correspondent of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] to the effect that I had declared that no one opposed the league of nations except socialists, Bolsheviks, and anarchists. I made no such statement. What I said was that the organized efforts in the United States against the league of nations consisted of organizations for political purposes, for the purpose of making political capital, and outside of that in the United States there was no church organization, no women's organization, no labor organization, no business organization, no educational organization, and no organization of a nonpartisan character having for its purpose the welfare of the country that supported those Senators who are here antagonizing and seeking to destroy the league of nations as a method of securing international peace. I declared, furthermore, and I repeat, that there are certain organizations in the United States and in other countries anxiously at work to destroy the league of nations, and that those organizations are the anarchists, the Bolsheviks, and the organized enemies of society and of government everywhere; and that is true not only in the United States but it is true in other countries as well.

In the New York Times of yesterday this special cablegram appeared. It is from Berne, Switzerland:

Swiss Presidents have hitherto been spared from molestation by anarchists or madmen, but since the Bolshevik propaganda has penetrated this small Republic even the venerable and highly respected chief of State, M. Ador, has been the victim of something much resembling an attempt on his life.

Yesterday an individual named Weissenbach, pushing aside the President's woman secretary, forced an entrance in M. Ador's room and is reported to have seized the President by the throat. He might have strangled M. Ador had not the brother of the Swiss defense minister rushed in and rescued him.

Weissenbach was one of those who recently took part in a meeting in opposition to Switzerland joining the league of nations. It is not yet known whether he is a Bolshevik or is crazy or both.

Last Sunday, when Federal Councilor Callender was addressing a mass meeting at Winterthur in favor of Switzerland joining the league, a number of Bolsheviks attempted unsuccessfully to break up the meeting. It is now believed that the Bolsheviks and the Pan Germans are cooperating in an endeavor to prevent Switzerland from becoming a member of the league.

Nevertheless, the Swiss Government, realizing that should Switzerland not join the league within the stipulated time Geneva might not become the league seat, has called a special session of Parliament for November 10 to decide the question. As the decision must finally come to a referendum, many of the ablest Swiss intellectuals, historians, and others are addressing mass meetings explaining the objects of the league, and they urge that Switzerland join it immediately.

This would probably have been needless but for the pro-German and Bolshevik propaganda and press. All Swiss newspapers which during the war served the cause of the German general staff are now opposing the league, while all which were and are friendly to the Entente, including the entire French-Swiss press, are advocating it.

President Wilson's illness has cast a positive gloom over French Switzerland, and is sincerely deplored by leading German Swiss papers, such as the Neue Zürcher Zeitung. Although it would hardly be credited, yet Bolshevik, Sinn Fein, and pro-German circles are positively rejoicing, and the hope is openly expressed that, now that the President lies prostrate, his senatorial opponents will succeed in wrecking his policy and prevent America from joining the league.

Mr. President, that is only a sample of the news that comes from all over the world, that the Bolsheviks and the lawless elements and the enemies of society and those who oppose stable government everywhere in the world object to this league of nations. They are the organized plotters against it in other countries, and they are the organized bodies against it in the United States. Where are any church organizations opposing the league of nations? Where are any business men's organizations opposing the league of nations? Where are any labor organizations opposing the league of nations in the United States? Where are any educational organizations in the United States opposing the league of nations? Where are any such organizations having at heart the welfare of the country, the stability of government, and the public welfare, opposing the idea of the nations getting together and organizing for the peace of the world? There are none such.

Mr. President, heretofore the world has been organized for war. This is an effort to organize the nations for peace; and the reason that the Bolsheviks and the anarchists and the enemies of society everywhere object to organizing the world for peace is that they fear it will stabilize government and prevent the arrival of anarchy.

I do not say that Senators are purposely cooperating with such organizations; but I repeat, and I challenge contradiction, that every newspaper in the United States published in the interest of anarchy, extreme socialism, and Bolshevism, without any exception, is opposing the league of nations, and every organization of that character which is opposed to the stability of society and of government is also opposing it.

I say this merely in reply to the correspondent of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], who seems to resent the

statement I made that those organizations are opposing the league of nations.

Senators may not like the partnership; they may not like to have that sort of support in their effort to defeat the league of nations; but they have it, whether they want it or not.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of discussing briefly the question which is supposed to be now before the Senate, and that is the first amendment reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, intended to secure equality of voting to the United States in the council and assembly of the league of nations.

I intend to vote for that amendment, as I voted for it in the committee. I am aware that it is inadequate for the purposes for which it is intended; I am aware that if the second amendment is also adopted it still remains in a degree inadequate; but, Mr. President, I vote for it because I believe most profoundly in the principle which it is intended to carry out. I shall vote gladly to make it more adequate, if that is desired by the Senate. I shall vote gladly for a reservation, if it is necessary to have that in order to make the principle of equal voting more effective.

In saying that, Mr. President, I trust nobody will imagine that because I differ from them as to the correctness of voting for this amendment I in any way intend to impugn their patriotism or their motives. To me it is inconceivable that any man who has at heart the welfare, the safety, and the independence of the United States should be willing to vote for the ratification of this treaty without reservation or amendment. Yet I do not question in the slightest degree the patriotism or the motives of those who take a different view. Still less do I question the motives of those who have the same purpose that I have, which is to protect our right to an equal vote in the council and assembly of the league, but who prefer to proceed by reservation rather than amendment. Senators who prefer reservations, but who have the same purpose that I have, I have no question are just as thoroughly American and patriotic as I am. Men who are aiming at the same purpose and trying to attain the same object may differ as to methods, but that does not imply that they are not equally honest in their desire for the general result.

Mr. President, I did not intend to go further on this point, but the Senator from Nebraska has just gone through his favorite morning rehearsal of the organizations and of the very worthy people who favor the league of nations without amendment or without reservation and, I may add, usually without reading more than the title of the instrument. My own personal belief is—and it is based upon letters and resolutions without number, with which I have not sought to load the RECORD—that the great mass of the American people to-day, if we could put the treaty to a popular vote, would be against ratifying the league as it stands. The great majority of the American people to-day, in my judgment, are either against any league or demand effective reservations in order to protect amply and thoroughly the United States.

It is worse than idle, Mr. President, to attempt in an indirect fashion to imply that those who take the view which I and others hold are Bolsheviks and socialists and pro-German. I am not concerned to defend my record in the war. I think it speaks for itself. I think my votes will be found to have been unbrokenly against Germany at a time when some others were inclined to cast and did cast votes which I thought were at least sympathetic with Germany and her cause. I do not think anything is gained by such charges as I have described.

Mr. President, there is one thing which I think it would be well to have understood, and that is that there are many Senators in this body whose votes can not be determined by guesses at public opinion or by anyone's convenience. There are many Senators here—a large majority, I think—who are wholly indifferent to what their own political future may be, who care nothing for party advantage or disadvantage, but who profoundly believe, and their belief rests upon the deepest conviction, that this treaty as it stands endangers the safety, the independence, and the welfare of the United States in the future; and no outside pressure, no testimonials to the virtues of the League to Enforce Peace, have the slightest effect upon them. They make up their own minds as to what they think the best interests of their own country demand, and they are not to be guided or influenced by outside pressure, and least of all by being told what Europe wants. The mischief in this treaty lies in the fact, and the reason that it was hung here is, that it was made up with the

sole view of what Europe wanted, and the rights and interests of the United States were forgotten too completely by some of the gentlemen who purported to represent us in Paris.

Mr. President, I wish to say something more direct in regard to the pending amendment. One of the objections which has been made to amendments, and which has been a very effective and very unreal objection, is that an amendment would require a reconvening of the peace conference and cause great delay. The peace conference can not be reconvened, because it has never gone out of session. The representatives of all the signatory powers are sitting in Paris at this moment and have been for nearly a year past. They are still engaged in parceling out Europe. They are still engaged in telling other countries what they are to do, which some of the countries totally disregard, as in the case of Roumania; and they are very diligently occupied. They are there and can consider any amendment, and consider it quickly, if we should send it to them. They are in session. It would be perfectly easy, if necessary, to recall them, but it is not necessary; or an amendment could be sent by a note to each power, but that is not necessary. We are not delaying the ratification, for, if I am correctly informed, no ratifications have yet been deposited, and until deposited with the official authority in Paris the ratification is not complete.

But, Mr. President, the proposition that the Senate must not amend the treaty is equivalent to nullifying the power of the Senate. The Senate in the past has amended some 70 treaties—I think that is the number now—I mean amended, not put on reservations. Those amendments have been accepted, and the treaties have gone into effect. We began with the first and one of the most famous treaties, the Jay treaty, in 1795. That was a treaty which had a profound influence upon the condition of the country at the time, and upon its future as well. Washington had determined that it was above all things essential to keep the country out of war, and for that purpose to secure the withdrawal of the English posts on our western frontier. In order to bring about that settlement he sacrificed, as was shown a year or two later, the alliance which we had had with France. It was a very great and a very wise act. In that treaty the Senate made a very important amendment in regard to one clause. It was accepted and the treaty became a law.

This amendment does not touch the treaty with Germany; it is an amendment to one of the league provisions. Therefore, it does not have to go to Germany, which was another bugbear that has been put forward with great effect. Germany is not a member of the league. She is not in the list of those invited to accede. Whenever she is admitted to the league she will take the league as she finds it, because in the interval the league has full power to make amendments. This was admitted by the President in the conversation which the Foreign Relations Committee held with him at the White House—that the right of amendment was undoubted, and that Germany would have to take the league as she found it. The point is too obvious to argue.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption at that point?

Mr. LODGE. I will.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. While the Senator says the right to amend the league is undoubted, what does he think of the possibility of amending it as a practicable thing?

Mr. LODGE. You mean under the provision of the league for amendment?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; under article 26.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is practically unamendable. That article, as I read it, requires that each country should agree to the amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Every member having representation in the council, and a majority of all the other members.

Mr. LODGE. It reads:

Amendments to this covenant will take effect when ratified by the members of the league—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. All the members—

Mr. LODGE. "The members of the league" means the countries which are members. It continues:

Whose representatives compose the council and by a majority of the members of the league whose representatives compose the assembly.

It is very plain to me that in the language "whose representatives compose the council and by a majority of the members of the league whose representatives compose the assembly" the words "whose representatives compose" are purely descriptive. I do not think there can be any question whatever that any amendment to this league would have to be submitted to the ratifying power in each country, just as a treaty is submitted.

Those who are represented on the council, the nine countries, would, under the provision of this league, have to be unanimous. If I may draw a parallel, it is very much as if we provided that in amending the Constitution the Thirteen Original States must all agree unanimously to an amendment and a majority of the other States in order to carry an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator read the rest of article 26?

Mr. LODGE (reading):

No such amendment shall bind any member of the league which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a member of the league.

That is a slight digression. I do not think the amending provision is practically of any value. Still, the amending power is there in that form.

Now, another point in regard to Germany's acceptance, of which I was speaking. Even if Germany had any right to say anything, which she has not, it would be very easy to make her agree to any amendment. The allied and associated powers have already compelled her to change her constitution in regard to the annexation of Austria, and if they can do that they certainly could secure her agreement to any amendment we choose to make. But it would not be necessary to submit it to her.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the amendment. I have no feeling whatever growing out of the fact that it is Great Britain which has six votes. I should feel just as strongly about it if France, Italy, or any other of the signatories of the league had the same superiority of voting.

During the years of neutrality I did all I could, in my humble way, in the Senate to defend the policies of England in regard to the blockade, a blockade based chiefly on international decisions made by us during the Civil War. I defended the policy of England in that respect at a time when the ranks of the defenders of the English policy were not overcrowded. It is with no feeling whatever, therefore, because it happens to be the British Empire which has these six votes that I advocate equality in voting power. I find no fault with Great Britain, because it was her draft of the league which was taken as its basis. That was wholly within her right, of course. I think perhaps it would have been as wise, more judicious, if she had left the explanation of article 21, covering the Monroe doctrine, to us. But her delegation gave an official and a correct interpretation of that article. I find no fault whatever with the fact that the secretary general of the league, which is the most important office, and its occupant, the man who will have greater influence than anyone else, is Sir Eric Drummond; or that Sir Herbert Ames, of Toronto, Canada, should be the financial director of the permanent secretariat of the league; or that Sir David Henderson of England should be the director general of the Red Cross societies league, organized under article 25 of the covenant; or that Mr. W. A. Appleton was recently elected president of the international division of trade unions in preparation for the labor conference to be held here in October under the auspices of the league. If the other members of the league wish these four great offices to be in the hands of Great Britain, I have not a word to say; I have no possible objection to it. I have no doubt that these gentlemen will perform their duties well.

Nor, Mr. President, do I grudge Great Britain anything she receives under the treaty. The valor, the wonderful fighting, of her armies, through four years, have my deepest admiration. The splendor of her sacrifices all the world admires, and the silent fortitude and undaunted courage of her people are beyond the need of praise. Though all the nations won the war, and we had the good fortune to come in and turn the scale at the last and most crucial moment, no one can deny that it was owing to the fleet of Great Britain that the war was not early lost. I say I grudge her nothing that she receives. But there is one point, Mr. President, at which I stop. I do not think that she or any other country should have more votes in the league of nations than we have.

Mr. President, when the peace conference was called the old international rule that each nation, whether small or large, was a sovereign entity and therefore was entitled to a vote equal to that of any other nation was recognized. I was unable to see then, and I can not see now, how any other rule could be adopted. When it came to the voting in the league, it seemed to me that whatever defect there might be in the general international rule, it was the only practicable one. The only alternative would have been a democratic division of votes according to population, and that seemed to present a great many complications.

If we had gone on the principle of 1 vote for every 10,000,000 inhabitants, for instance, China would have had 40 delegates;

of course, if England had counted India in she would have had 35 delegates from India, besides her own. But China would have had 40 delegates to 4 from France, 4 from Great Britain, and 10 from the United States. I merely mention this as an illustration of the difficulty of granting votes on the basis of population. Therefore we adhered to the old rule that each nation, great or small, should have one vote.

But before the terms of the league were agreed to or the treaty signed, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and India were made members of the league. Of course, four of those are self-governing dominions. The basis on which India was put in, I have never been able to discover. In addition, there is no doubt that Great Britain controls entirely the vote of the Kingdom of Hejaz; and, also, when Persia becomes a member, will control the vote of Persia.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And Portugal.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and probably others. But those are questions with which we have nothing to do.

Under the treaty as it stands, the fact remains that England has six votes and we have one. I think that is an unsound basis for the league. I think it is wrong in principle, and that it will tend to promote ill feeling and not make for peace or good will. I suppose that we could have insisted that we should have a vote for Porto Rico and a vote for the Philippines and a vote for Guam and a vote for the Virgin Islands, three of them self-governing dominions, if you choose to apply that test; and the other, Guam, is a part of the territory of the United States. I should be very sorry myself to see the United States attempt to secure voting power in that way.

Now, Mr. President, I am very far from wishing that the four self-governing dominions of England should not be members of the league. They are entitled to it by their services, their sacrifices, and their character. I do not wish to deprive one of them of a vote. I am glad they are in the league. I could have spared the Sultan of Hejaz, but I am glad to have Canada in the league; I should be very sorry if she were not there. But I think that we should come back to the principle which ought not to be abandoned, and that if the league is to go on we should have an equal vote with Great Britain.

I have looked up in the last Whitaker's Almanac, which is an English publication—apparently their last censuses are not later than 1911—and I find that the total white population of the British Empire was 59,000,000—England and Wales, 36,070,492; Scotland, 4,760,904; Ireland, 4,390,219; Canada, 7,250,000; Australia, 5,000,000; New Zealand, 1,200,000; and the Union of South Africa, 1,276,242; in all, 59,947,857. That population has probably increased since 1911. But even allowing for any unreasonable rate of increase, the population of the United States still exceeds all the white population of the British Empire. Therefore, on the basis of population alone, we should have an equal vote.

Mr. President, as this is a matter that has been somewhat discussed, I wish to show what I have never doubted, what I think is clear on the face of the instrument, precisely the interpretation given to it by Great Britain, by the Canadians, and by South Africa. I am not wise enough to say what the gentlemen who made these utterances meant in the recesses of their inner consciousness. I am simple, and I can not go beyond what they said. This has been read before, but it will do no harm to read it again; it is brief:

The question having been raised as to the meaning of article 4 of the league of nations covenant, we have been requested by Sir Robert Borden to state whether we concur in his view that upon the true construction of the first and second paragraphs of that article representatives of the self-governing dominions of the British Empire may be selected or named as members of the council. We have no hesitation in expressing our entire concurrence in this view. If there were any doubt, it would be entirely removed by the fact that the articles are not subject to a narrow or technical construction.

If that is not a statement that Canada may be placed in the council, or New Zealand, or any of them, I am unable to see how language could be plainer. That statement is signed by M. Clemenceau, President Woodrow Wilson, and David Lloyd-George.

Sir Robert Borden, who is a very able man, made a speech before the Canadian Parliament. I think it has heretofore been printed in the Record, but I desire to read a few passages from it. He begins by saying:

The status of the dominions at the peace conference was the subject of long and earnest discussion. Various methods, which it is not necessary to explain, were suggested. In the end I proposed that there should be a distinctive representation for each dominion similar to that accorded to the smaller allied powers—

Nobody has any doubt whatever as to the vote and power the smaller allied powers have in the league—

and, in addition, that the British Empire representation of five delegates should be selected from day to day from a panel made up of representatives of the United Kingdom and the dominions.

That reference is to the delegates to the peace conference, and they were changed so as to allow representation to the various British dominions. He then says:

At first strong objection was made to the proposed representation of the British dominions. Subsequently there was a full discussion in the British Empire delegation, at which a firm protest was made against any recession from the proposal adopted in London. In the end that proposal was accepted.

Then, later he says:

I proposed that the assent of the King as high contracting party to the various treaties should, in respect of the Dominions, be signified by the signature of the Dominion plenipotentiaries.

That was adopted. Then, he says:

So that the Dominions appear therein as signatories and their concurrence in the treaties is thus given in the same manner as that of other nations.

This important constitutional development involved the issuance by the King, as high contracting party, of full powers to the various Dominion plenipotentiary delegates. In order that such powers issued to the Canadian plenipotentiaries might be based upon formal action of the Canadian Government, an order in council was passed on April 10, 1919, granting the necessary authority. Accordingly, I addressed a communication to the prime minister of the United Kingdom requesting that necessary and appropriate steps should be taken to establish the connection between this order in council and the issuance of the full powers by His Majesty, so that it might formally appear of record that they were issued on the responsibility of the Government of Canada.

Then, speaking of the Dominions, he says:

They are to become members as signatories of the treaty, and the terms of the document make no distinction between them and other signatory members.

If anything can be clearer than that, I do not know how it can be made clearer. The rights, the vote, and the authority of other signatory members are undisputed. Then, he says:

The future relationship of the nations of the empire must be determined in accordance with the will of the mother country and of each Dominion in a constitutional conference to be summoned in the not distant future. Undoubtedly it will be based upon equality of nationhood. Each nation must preserve unimpaired its absolute autonomy, but it must likewise have its voice as to those external relations which involve the issue of peace or of war. So that the Britannic commonwealth is in itself a community or league of nations which may serve as an exemplar to that world-wide league of nations which was founded on the 28th of last June.

The same powers being reposed in the world league of nations as in the British league of nations.

On behalf of my country, I stood firmly upon this solid ground: That in this, the greatest of all wars, in which the world's liberty, the world's justice—in short, the world's future destiny—were at stake, Canada had led the democracies of both the American continents. Her resolve had given inspiration, her sacrifices had been conspicuous, her effort was unabated to the end. The same indomitable spirit which made her capable of that effort and sacrifice made her equally incapable of accepting at the peace conference, in the league of nations or elsewhere, a status inferior to that accorded to nations less advanced in their development, less amply endowed in wealth, resources, and population, no more complete in their sovereignty and far less conspicuous in their sacrifice.

That is, he understood, and understood correctly, that they stand on the same ground as every other signatory, each of whom has one independent vote. If they stand on the same ground, each of the British colonies will have one independent vote.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has been argued by some distinguished advocates of the league that in a controversy between the United States and the British Empire to be submitted to the assembly for decision the United States, being a party in interest, is excluded and Great Britain and her five colonies would all be excluded. I should like to know if that is the view of the Senator from Massachusetts, or whether or not, upon the premises which he has laid down, the colonies, occupying in the league an equal status in every respect with other signatories and there being nothing in the league to the effect just stated, that those colonies would sit and vote as independent nations?

Mr. LODGE. Sir Robert Borden has declared in the plainest terms that they have the rights of every signatory nation. Every signatory nation has one independent vote, and the British colonies each have one independent vote, not to be determined by the British Empire in any way at all. Nothing could be clearer. If more evidence were needed, let me read what Gen. Smuts, who was one of the principal makers of the draft, said in regard to the relations of Great Britain and the dominions at the meeting of the Parliament of the Union of South Africa, at Cape Town on September 10. The dispatch is from the London Times and is dated September 10. Gen. Smuts said:

Regarding the league of nations, it was incorrect to say that in the league the British Empire was a unit. The Empire was a group, but South Africa had exactly the same rights and voice as England. Though England was a permanent member of the central council, South Africa could be elected to that council.

What could be plainer than that? Gen. Smuts, who was one of the principal makers of the instrument, so interprets it. There can not be any question that the British dominions will each have a separate vote.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, am I justified in understanding from that letter that England and South Africa might both be represented on the council at the same time?

Mr. LODGE. I think there is no question as to that. There is no limitation in the statement of Lloyd-George, Clemenceau, and the President in which, without qualification, they declare the British colonies to be eligible to the council.

Mr. WATSON. If the Senator will pardon me further, some have taken the position that the British Empire was entitled only to one representative on the council, and if that one representative came from Canada, then there could be no other representative from the British Empire.

Mr. LODGE. I see nothing whatever to justify that view. The statement is plain. Sir Robert Borden and Gen. Smuts, both able men, certainly were there and knew what they were doing, and they have stated that each of the self-governing dominions, including, of course, India, occupies the same position as that occupied by Belgium or Spain or any other country as a member of the league. It is the right of Belgium, if she has the opportunity, to have a representative on the council. If, as they state—and state correctly—the rights of the British colonies are the same as the rights of Belgium, which is one of the smaller signatory powers mentioned by them, they can not be deprived of the right to sit on the council.

Mr. President, I am not going to go over the well-trodden ground as to where the six votes count.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Assuming to be correct the position just taken by the Senator in regard to Canada and other dominions of the British Empire becoming members of the council, so that the empire might have more than one representative on the council, I should like to ask the Senator if that could occur except by the vote of the United States?

Mr. LODGE. No; it could not as the treaty now stands as to additional; but that does not alter the principle. It could be done, however, without the vote of the United States in the case of electing new members of the league. New members can be elected by two-thirds of the assembly; there is no limitation in that respect; and in constituting two-thirds of the assembly, of course, Great Britain has six votes to start with and two or three others that she controls, which will be a help toward electing her candidate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. Do I understand the Senator to say that if the British Empire were a party in interest and Canada were a member of the council, Canada could cast a vote?

Mr. LODGE. It is not necessary to state the case with reference to membership upon the council. The British Empire would have five votes in the assembly, if the dispute were taken there. If the British colonies have, as Sir Robert Borden and Gen. Smuts say they have, and as I think the treaty provides beyond a doubt, all the rights of other signatory powers their five votes can not be taken away from them. There is nothing in the treaty to justify a contrary conclusion.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. SHIELDS. In answering the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Jones] a few moments ago the Senator, as I understood him, said that one of the British dominions or provinces could not be elected on the council without the consent of the United States. I am not sure that that is the proper construction of the league covenant. Article 4 provides:

The council shall consist of representatives of principal allied and associated powers, together with representatives of four other members of the league. These four members of the league shall be selected by the assembly from time to time in its discretion. Until the appointment of the representatives of the four members of the league first selected by the assembly, representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Spain, and Greece shall be members of the council.

The question is whether it is a fact that there is required a unanimous vote in the assembly in the case of the election of new members to the council. Let us see. Article 5 provides:

Except where otherwise expressly provided in this covenant or by the terms of the present treaty, decisions at any meeting of the assembly or the council shall require the agreement of all of the members of the league represented at the meeting.

All matters of procedure at meetings of the assembly or of the council, including the appointment of committees to investigate particular mat-

ters, shall be regulated by the assembly or by the council, and may be decided by a majority of the members of the league represented at the meeting.

I hardly think that anyone would say that the election of a member of the council would be a "decision." A decision implies the passing upon a dispute where there is a controverted point, such as courts decide. It implies that the council is then sitting as a judicial body, while the matter of an election is one of procedure. Therefore I think that a majority can elect.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator about that. I answered the question of the Senator from New Mexico in a general way. On the face of the covenant as it stands, it may be contended, I think, that in the case of the election of additional members of the league whose representatives shall also be members of the council a unanimous vote of the council would be required. On the question of filling the four places which are left to the discretion of the assembly, however, I am very clear that they can be filled by the assembly alone, and that a unanimous vote is not required.

Mr. SHIELDS. I thought perhaps the Senator had not fully grasped the question.

Mr. LODGE. I did not guard my reply sufficiently. Of course, there is a great deal of dispute over that point, but I think we shall find that it will be decided in the way the Senator and I think it can be decided.

I am not blaming England for getting in her dominions. Take, for instance, the first article:

Any fully self-governing State, dominion, or colony not named in the annex may become a member of the league if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the assembly.

That is wholly a matter for the determination of the assembly. There the six votes of England count, and we have only one, and there is no veto possible by the requisition of unanimity.

England has Newfoundland, just as much entitled as Canada, as a self-governing dominion, to come in. It so happens that the only States that the words "self-governing dominion" exactly cover are English possessions. I do not wonder that England did it. I find no fault with her. She was looking after her own interests there. It was her duty to do it. It was perfectly right that she should. Where I find the fault is that we had nobody who cared for our interests as those of Great Britain were cared for.

Mr. President, I am not going over the points where they have their six votes to our one. They have been gone over many times, and will be gone over many times more. I have not any doubt, in the case of a dispute—I am not speaking now of a dispute with Canada or Great Britain, but a dispute between the United States and Japan—that England would have her six votes and we should have none; and if Great Britain herself were in a dispute, I think her five colonies would all have their votes just as much as Belgium and Italy would have their votes. They stand on the same ground.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, this matter has been discussed all the time as though England had six votes only. As I remember, Persia is one of the countries invited to become a member of the league.

Mr. LODGE. I mentioned Persia and the Kingdom of Hejaz. Of course, England controls both those votes.

Mr. SHIELDS. I was just going to call attention to the fact that The Nation, of London, has referred to that in stating that under this treaty negotiated right along while the league of nations covenant was pending, evidently hurried before it was perfected, England has taken over Persia, and will rule it completely—appoint all of its officers, run all of its internal affairs, and receive all of its revenues. In other words, it has a more complete control over Persia now than it has over India.

Mr. LODGE. It has complete control of its finances and its army, which gives it control of the country.

All I wish to say in conclusion—and I have taken more time than I had intended—is that what I am interested in, in this amendment, in any other form of it that may be presented, or in any reservation, is the principle involved. I can not, for myself, consent or admit that in the great assembly of the nations the vote of the United States should not be equal to that of any other power. You may turn and twist it as you please; Great Britain and her self-governing dominions, and India, which is a mere chattel of the Empire, have six votes and we have one in the assembly. That is something that I for one can not possibly agree to; and I propose to vote against it in whatever form of amendment, or reservation, or both, or either, it is presented. I will never admit for myself personally that the United States, in the great council of the nations, shall occupy a place of inferiority in power and in representation.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before proceeding to answer the argument of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I wish to refer to two statements just made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

I think he has not been entirely fair, although I know that he intends to be, in the broad declaration that Great Britain has six votes, carrying the assumption that there are six votes which Great Britain can declare upon every occasion; that the vote of Canada, the vote of India, the votes of Australia and South Africa can always be placed by Great Britain.

Of course, if the United States should be allowed six votes, those six votes would be cast by one entity and not by six different entities. Let us suppose that India insists that her citizens should have the right of emigration to Canada and settle in Canada—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment; let me finish the sentence—and that dispute in any way should come before the council or the assembly, and that the vote of India should be in favor of the emigration of Indians to Canada, and the vote of Canada without any possible question would be against it. Now, how could it be said that Great Britain cast either the vote of India or the vote of Canada? She could not cast them both, because they would be diametrically opposed to each other. If the question were a question of the right of Chinese or Indians to emigrate to South Africa and the white representative of South Africa opposed it and the Indian representative voted in favor of it, how could Great Britain cast the votes of both India and South Africa? I submit those two instances to show the fallacy of the claim that Great Britain has these votes.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I did not mean to imply that Great Britain could always command the votes of the four self-governing dominions. Of course, I do not think India is a happy example of what the Senator is speaking about, because the vote of India is cast from Downing Street. She has no opinion and nothing else, but her representative who signed the treaty was the secretary of state for India. But it might arise over Japanese immigration, and I quite agree that if it did arise, as the Senator suggests, the four self-governing dominions would vote with the United States, however England wanted them to vote.

I do not mean to say that they can not cast independent votes. Of course they can. That is my whole argument. My proposition is that on all questions affecting the Empire they will cast six votes.

Mr. McCUMBER. And my reply to that, Mr. President, is that if the dispute is one to which the Empire or any one of its self-governing members is a party, they can cast no vote, under article 15. Now, there may be a difference in the construction of that article. If there is a difference in the construction, then I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts absolutely that we could meet that by a reservation where there can be no possibility of any misconstruction.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, personally I think there can be but one construction. I think they have the same independent vote there that they would have in the example which the Senator suggested. I can not think their vote can be taken away from them. I do think, admitting that it is doubtful, as the Senator says, that should be covered; but I want to cover them all if I can.

Mr. McCUMBER. But, Mr. President, the vote is taken away from them by the absolute and direct declaration of article 15, which declares that parties to the dispute shall be excluded; and by every process of logic and true reasoning a dispute with a part must be a dispute with the whole, and a dispute with a dominant must be a dispute with each one of its substantive parts.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment. So that no matter whether you say they have a vote or not, you must say that they have no vote if they are a party to the dispute; and if Great Britain has a dispute, and I can not imagine a single case in which the British Empire as an entity would have a dispute, would be a party to the dispute, which would not include every part of the great British Empire.

I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the proposition stated by the Senator from North Dakota that where there is a dispute the British Empire must speak as a unit is the very proposition which both Mr. Borden and Gen. Smuts rejected, and stated that there might be conditions in which the colonies should have a separate vote, and they intended that the league of nations should be so constructed that they would. Now, when

this league of nations gets into operation—if that unfortunate hour should ever occur—suppose that they should put that construction on it. Then what would the Senator from North Dakota do about it?

Mr. McCUMBER. I say they could not put any such construction upon it.

Mr. BORAH. There is no appeal; there is no review; there is no court of review. The Senator would not have any say about it at all. They would be the last to speak upon the subject. What would the Senator do about it?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if this league of nations were made up of the British Empire and one other country alone, there is a bare possibility that with the British Empire and its constituent parts having six votes and we having only one, that construction might be adopted by the league; but, Mr. President, no one believes for a single moment that France would give it that construction, that Italy would give it that construction, or that any other of the nations of the world desiring equality would give it any such strained construction as that. Whether they would or not, however, there is no question on earth but that we have the votes in the Senate to give it that construction.

Mr. McCORMICK. In the Senate?

Mr. McCUMBER. In the Senate, in the matter of a reservation, and a reservation which will become a part of the treaty. We can place that in the reservations in a way that will cure any such inequality, if you concede that the instrument gives any such right.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a single question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator intends, then, to support a reservation which will require the assent of the British Government to its terms before the ratification is effective?

Mr. McCUMBER. I intend, Mr. President, to vote for a reservation which shall declare unequivocally that under the provisions of article 15 a dispute with any part of an empire represented in the assembly is a dispute with the entire empire, and a dispute with a dominant country of the empire is also a dispute with every part of it. I want to make that so clear that there can be no contention, and I do not care what the words are that you use to make it clear.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, this is the point I want to have made perfectly clear, or, rather, ask the Senator from North Dakota to make perfectly clear. The agreement of the British Empire, at present accorded six votes, is necessary to bind it to the interpretation which the Senator would put upon the covenant.

Mr. McCUMBER. Whether the British Government ever agrees to it or not, it does not bind us when we declare we will not be bound. So that disposes of that feature of the case.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that the reservation which the Senator will introduce will take care of the six votes of the British Empire in any controversy in which the British Empire is involved?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Suppose Ecuador and Peru should have a controversy; would the British Empire have six votes to the United States' one vote in the determination of that question?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I do not say that the British Empire would have six votes.

Mr. WATSON. Not the British Empire, but the English dominions and colonies.

Mr. McCUMBER. I would say that Canada would have a vote separately, cast separately, dictated according to the interests of its own Government, and South Africa would have a vote. They would have a vote on what? I want to get at the dangers which might arise out of that situation. Assuming that they have a vote in a dispute, we will say, between Ecuador and Peru, or in a dispute between Bulgaria and Serbia, what would the vote be on?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will tell you what it would be on.

Mr. WATSON. It would be on whatever was the controversy.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; it will not be in the settlement of that dispute; it will not be trying that dispute. It will be in ascertaining what the facts are in that dispute, and publishing those facts to the countries. I have no great fear of any danger in giving Canada that vote, inasmuch as I give Hedjaz a vote, inasmuch as I give a vote to black Haiti, and Liberia, and half a score of other countries that never turned their hands over in this great World War. In other words, I am not afraid of Canada upon a question of finding what the true facts are in

a dispute between these countries. That is the real thing and the only thing that Canada or any other country can pass judgment upon in case the dispute is referred to the assembly.

Now, Mr. President, I want to take up the other statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I do not know but that he corrected it himself, but he made, in the first instance, the declaration, as I understood him, that in the election of new members to the council, such election could be had by a majority vote of the assembly.

Mr. LODGE. No; new members of the league.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, new members of the league.

Mr. LODGE. Under article 1.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator mean new members of the league, which new members may have a representation in the council?

Mr. LODGE. I mean only what the treaty says, "new members of the league."

Mr. McCUMBER. We were discussing the only pertinent question to which that could apply, and that was the question whether Canada could get into the council.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. McCUMBER. If I understood the Senator's purpose, it was in some way to establish the fact that Canada could have a representation in the council through the action of the assembly in voting new members into the council.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; only in the case of the four members.

Mr. McCUMBER. Even in the case of the four members, that is not true.

Mr. LODGE. I will not argue that now, but I believe that is the case. This is what I was quoting about the assembly—

Any fully self-governing State, dominion, or colony not named in the annex may become a member of the league if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the assembly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not question that at all. I agree entirely. But that has nothing to do with the matter of electing members to the council or electing new members who may become members of the council. If Senators will turn to the second paragraph of article 4 they will find that it reads—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me finish this first, and then I will yield. It reads:

With the approval of the majority of the assembly the council may name additional members of the league, whose representatives shall always be members of the council.

What does that mean? It means simply this, that by a majority vote of the assembly, concurred in by a unanimous vote of the council, they can nominate new members, additional members, who may become members of the council; that is, of the permanent group in the council. In addition to that it says:

The council with like approval—

That is, the approval of the assembly—

may increase the number of members of the league to be selected by the assembly for representation on the council.

In every instance the council must act unanimously, because under another provision of the covenant every vote of the council to become effective must be unanimous, except where otherwise specially provided, and this is not one of the cases where it is "otherwise specially provided." I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no question about the accuracy of the last statement of the Senator from North Dakota, but I gathered from the statement which he made just a moment ago that there was some distinction between the admission of new members of the league itself and eligibility to sit in the council. Is it not a fact that when any nation or self-governing colony is once admitted to membership in the league it is eligible to any position in the league?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I think not. That is one of the features I intend to discuss in answering the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and I will discuss it with great care.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well. I hope the Senator will describe how it is that under this covenant there may eventually come about a state of affairs in which there shall be two classes of membership in the league.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator mean in the league or in the council?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I mean in the league. My contention is that once a State becomes a member of the league of nations it also becomes eligible to any position in the assembly or the council.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the question we were discussing, and the question that I want to hold to in this discussion, is whether or not there is any way by which you can vote Canada or Australia into the council, in addition to the British Empire, as represented as such, and that I intend to cover.

Mr. BORAH. I think that is the crux of the whole situation.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. If that proposition is determined in favor of the view that is entertained by the Senator from North Dakota, I concede all the propositions which the Senator from North Dakota undertook to make. But if it should be determined that you can not elect as a member of the council a representative of a dominion or a colony, then I think the Senator will agree that his entire argument must fall with that proposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no, Mr. President. Even if that construction were held to be sound, the construction that there was possibility of the power to vote four or five of the British dominions into the council—and you can vote five if you can vote one—it is still akin to an impossibility, because under the vote that would have to be given and under the whole spirit of the instrument, it would never be done. But I am insisting that it can not be done, and I am willing to say that from my construction it can not be done. From the Senator's construction it is almost an impossibility to conceive that the other nations of the world in this league would do what the Senator says is a possibility. I will stand on both propositions.

Mr. BORAH. With all due respect to the Senator, he confuses two propositions. I am debating the proposition now as to whether or not, under the terms of the league, they have a right to be elected to the council. Whether or not they could go out among the members and secure the votes to do it is another proposition entirely. Perhaps Belgium never could secure the votes. Perhaps Serbia never could secure the votes. No one will deny that under the league they have the right to the position if they can secure the votes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am not confused in the slightest degree. I deny that that is a fair construction, and what I am saying is that even if you give it that construction, it never would happen. Even if the Senator gives the provision that construction and that Borden gives it that construction, or that Gen. Smuts gives it that construction, I can not give it that construction, and I am going to give my reasons.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I knew the Senator was not going to give it that construction.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly not, because the Senator has heard me make the statement a great many times; not quite as often as the Senator has stated he would give the opposite construction, but quite often.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to consider some of the statements made by the Senator from Idaho the other day. Two days ago the Senator from Idaho made an address in the Senate in which he sought to combat the arguments and the conclusions which I arrived at, and which I presented on the 6th day of this month, relative to the so-called Johnson amendment. His address was not printed in the RECORD of the proceedings of the day it was given, and I had no opportunity, of course, to answer it immediately after it was delivered.

The Senator not only criticizes my conclusions, but also intimates that my argument is subject to the same claim of unfairness with which I have charged many of the arguments made throughout the country, and sometimes on the floor of the Senate, of those who are opposed to any league of nations whatever.

Mr. President, one of the peculiar characteristics of orators, both real and presumptive, is the tendency to totally disregard facts. Depending more upon their ability to convince by well-constructed and well-delivered sentences, they pay less attention to close analysis than do those who are not so gifted.

If a fact stands in the way of their forensic eloquence, so much the worse for the fact. I admit, Mr. President, that oratory travels more swiftly than truth, but I am certain that truth will travel longer, and upon that I base my hope that in the end the American people will understand the true meaning and the true purpose of the league of nations; not understand it to be perfect, because it is very far from being perfect, in my opinion, but understand that it is a right step in the right direction; and that it is not subject to many and most of the criticisms that are urged against it.

What I have complained of, and what I still condemn, is not that their declarations have been devoid of any semblance of truth but that they persistently avoid presenting the whole truth; that anyone unacquainted with the text of the treaty, listening to their arguments, would draw the conclusion that the council or the assembly had the right to pass final judgment in a dispute between nations; that the council or the assembly would sit as a board of arbitration or as a court to determine and bind nations by its judgments. They never once say to their audiences that by the terms of the treaty, where the nations agreed that they would arbitrate their arbitrable questions, such arbit-

ration is entirely outside of the league, outside of either the council or the assembly. They never mention the fact that by article 13, even in the matter of the agreement to submit arbitrable questions to arbitration, each nation must itself determine whether the subject is suitable for arbitration.

They always forget to tell their audiences that the only thing which each nation agrees to in reference to its disputes is either to submit what it thinks is suitable for arbitration to some arbitrable tribunal to be agreed upon between the nation itself and the disputing nation, and entirely outside of the league of nations, or, if it declines to submit the matter to arbitration at all, that it will allow the council or the assembly to make an inquiry into the facts for the purpose, first, of using its good offices to bring about a settlement by agreement, and if those persuasive efforts fail, then, secondly, to investigate the facts and report such facts to the people of the disputing countries.

They always forget to tell their audiences that the only power that is vested in either the council or the assembly in case of a dispute, and I am considering only disputes, is, first, to endeavor to effect a settlement, and if that fails, second, to make a report containing the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

They fail always to tell their audiences that, even in this matter of ascertaining what the facts are in the case, all disputants are excluded in making such findings. They fail to tell their audiences that in a dispute with the British Empire, the British Empire, with all its votes, is excluded.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. They assume before their audiences that those dominions are never excluded. They do not even admit that anyone construes the instrument as excluding every part of the British Empire where there is a dispute with the British Empire or any of its parts. They assume for granted that there is only the construction that each part has a vote, contrary to the declarations of the President as to the understanding in Europe, contrary to declarations of others, and contrary, according to my construction, to the instrument itself.

I yield to the Senator now, it being on this point, of course.

Mr. McCORMICK. It is on the point to which the Senator was speaking. When he attributes a want of candor to those who differ with him—

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I will not let the Senator say that. I have never stated that there was a want of candor on the part of everyone who disagrees with me.

Mr. McCORMICK. I did not say everyone.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of anyone, so far as that is concerned. I think I understand the treaty; and in our discussions I think, as a rule, we have tried to discuss it fairly with each other, even though we draw different conclusions.

Mr. McCORMICK. But does not the Senator imply—

Mr. McCUMBER. But there are many general bald statements that are made which would carry a wrong impression and a different inference unless explanatory statements were made in relation to it. I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator complains that those of us who hold a view very different from his own do not discuss all the provisions and implications of the treaty relative to disputes. There is no one in the Senate who has made a more thorough study of the treaty than the Senator from North Dakota, and yet I have not heard him or any other Senator speak of the relation between two paragraphs found the first in article 5 and the second in article 15. The first, dealing with matters of procedure, provides that the appointment of committees "may be decided by a majority of the members of the league represented at the meeting." Before I touch upon the importance of the committee report I will ask the Senator to turn to article 15:

If the council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the members of the league reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

Mr. McCUMBER. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. McCORMICK. I submit, first, that the aggregate six votes of the British Empire may very well be of great influence in constituting the original committee; that that committee, preparing the case, rendering the decision, will put some party to the controversy in the wrong before the members of the league. I submit further that, even though there be no unanimous and binding report, such as the Senator suggests, having been put in the wrong the members of the league then reserve to themselves the right to take such action as against the power which has been put in the wrong by the committee as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

Mr. McCUMBER. That necessitates my asking the Senator a question. How are the members of the league now to carry out that provision under his construction?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator's question is not quite clear. Does he mean under article 15?

Mr. McCUMBER. Under article 15, which reads—

Mr. McCORMICK. If the council fails to reach a report, the members of the league—

Mr. McCUMBER. Then—

The members of the league reserve to themselves—

It speaks of the members—

the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

I ask the Senator how he thinks the members of the league would proceed to effectuate that purpose under his own construction of that part of the paragraph?

Mr. McCORMICK. I conceive that they would consider themselves authorized to take any steps they saw fit, even as though no covenant of the league existed.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is absolutely right. In other words, it is outside of the league entirely, it is outside of the council, it is outside of the assembly, and the only thing that the several nations can do is to go back to their old status and as nations, not through the instrumentality of the league, but as separate and individual nations, through their own diplomatic channels, attempt to make a settlement outside of the league.

Mr. McCORMICK. But in the meantime, Mr. President, the committee appointed to consider the case, constituted by a majority of the members voting, would have made up the case, and the Senator very well knows how all-important is the case presented to the public opinion of the world. This is not a judicial instrument; it is a political instrument.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is not holding to one particular ground very well, because his first statement was based upon what would be done and how I would construe the last portion of this part of article 15 in case there was no settlement, in case they did not arrive at any conclusion. I stated that it meant exactly what it said, that then the whole question would have to hark back to the separate nations themselves. The Senator now asks about the matter of a board or a committee being appointed and of allowing Canada—that is naturally what he means—and Australia a voice in determining who this committee or subcommittee might be. Of course, if it is in the council, there would probably be no subcommittee, because it is a small body. In the assembly there would undoubtedly be appointed a committee, and in the appointment of that committee there would be no question that Canada and Australia would have a vote. In the appointment of a committee to find a fact they would have a vote.

Mr. McCORMICK. Or to render an opinion.

Mr. McCUMBER. To render an opinion is to render an opinion upon the facts. That is finding a fact of what the dispute is.

The Senator assumes that by an action of this kind Canada and Australia pack the jury. Well, Mr. President, I do not think so. I accord a greater degree of national honor than that to every one of these nations. I am not afraid of anyone packing a jury against the United States in the appointment of a little committee which is to determine a fact. I agree with the Senator that they would have a vote; and that matter, which would be a matter of procedure only, would not require a unanimous vote. So there is but little disagreement upon that point. I have not any fear of it.

Now, Mr. President, I come right back to the arguments of which I complain—not arguments made in the Senate; I do not mean that; but arguments made before audiences over the United States. If the orators I have in mind would present the whole case to their audiences, there would be an entirely different conclusion drawn as to any great danger or injustice to the United States by allowing Canada and Australia each to have a vote with the United States in determining what are the true facts in a dispute between Bulgaria and Roumania or any other countries outside of the British Empire. The American public, knowing the respect for law and truth which are inherent in the Australian and Canadian character, would have no fear of a finding of fact by the representatives of either of those countries being contrary to the evidence in the case.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] pays a high tribute to Canada, and says that he wants Canada to remain in the league of nations. If he wants Canada and Australia and South Africa to remain members of the league, it is because he has confidence in them; and I, Mr. President, have the same confidence.

It is the failure to present the whole truth concerning the treaty and presenting the half truth in such a way as to mis-

lead of which I complain. My criticism of that course every Senator knows to be well founded. I may be in error in the matter of construing the meaning of any phrase or sentence of the treaty, but I do try my best to ascertain the true meaning of the treaty, its full application and limitations.

Mr. President, I shall proceed to reply to some of the broad declarations of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. As to the right of Canada to claim representation in the council, he says—and I quote his words:

In the first place, upon what theory can it be argued that the Dominions can not have representation in the council? Is there any provision in the league covenant which inhibits it?

I answer, without hesitation, "Yes; there is." Again he says:

Is there any clause or phrase in the covenant itself which says that Canada, if she can secure the votes, is not entitled to representation on the council, just as any other nation may become a member of the council if she can secure the votes?

I reply again, "Yes; both in the words and in the whole spirit of the covenant." Again, he says:

Is there any obstacle to Canada becoming a member of the council that does not exist with reference to every other signer of the treaty?

Again, I reply, "By both the spirit and by the wording of the instrument, there is such an obstacle." Again, he says:

Is there any obstacle to Australia becoming a member of the council, if she can secure the votes, any more than in the case of Belgium?

And, again, I answer, "Yes; there is."

I refer now to the very article creating the council, article 4, calling attention before reading it to the fact that it is not members themselves that constitute the council. In all the arguments that we hear we confuse members with representatives. It is not the members but the representatives of certain members that constitute the council. It would be just as improper to say that the Senate is composed of New York and Pennsylvania and other States, naming them, as it is to say that the council is composed of the United States, the British Empire, and other nations, enumerating them; second, that the council is made up of the two groups of representatives, one permanent and the other temporary.

Now, I want to read article 4. It reads thus:

The council shall consist of representatives of the principal allied and associated powers—

And, of course, those are the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan—

together with representatives of four other—

Now, I want to call attention to the word "other"—

four other members of the league.

The representatives of the five mentioned powers are permanent. The last paragraph of article 4 reads—and I again call attention to this:

At the meetings of the council each member represented on the council shall have one vote, and may have not more than one representative.

Remember, it does not say that each representative upon the council shall have one vote, but it says that each member represented on the council shall have one vote through that representative. That means that the British Empire represented in the council shall have one vote through a representative, and does not mean anything else. That is not all.

Now, remember that it is not Great Britain but the British Empire, which includes Great Britain and Scotland and Ireland and every domain of the British Empire, that is represented. It is claimed, because Canada and Australia have each been given a separate vote, an independent status in the assembly, that would entitle them to enjoy such separate entity and have a separate representative in the council, but the granting of a separate vote in the assembly does not change the eternal and everlasting fact that Canada is a part of the British Empire, and it is the British Empire as an entity alone that is represented in the council.

If this treaty should become the law of the land, a binding obligation between nations, and the British Empire should say, "The fact that this Empire is given permanent representation in the permanent group does not prevent, if there are enough votes to place me there, my right also to be a member of the temporary group," would anyone for a single moment concede that she could claim any such right? Would not everyone insist that this is not only against the spirit of the instrument but contrary to the wording which, after enumerating the permanent group, continues—

together with the representatives of four other members of the league.

That means members other than the British Empire. The words "other members of the league" mean that they must be members other than the whole as well as other than any part of the British Empire. If you can include Canada, you can, of course, include all the other British dominions, and you could

put two of the British Empire on the permanent list and still have four more places on the temporary list that could be filled by the British colonies, making it entirely a British council. I think that is an unreasonable construction; that it is against the whole spirit and intentment of the league of nations. Would not everyone insist that that would be not only against the spirit of the instrument but contrary to its wording? The words "other members" do not mean anything else than members other than the British Empire, after enumerating the British Empire.

I insist that not only by the spirit but by the terms of article 4 Great Britain can not divide herself so that she can keep her head in the permanent group and her feet in the temporary group and claim a separate vote for both the head and the feet in the council. If the Senator from Idaho thinks she can do this, if he thinks that it is not inconsistent with both the spirit and the words of article 4, then all I can say is that I most emphatically disagree with him.

But, Mr. President, I have been willing to concede his right and the right of other Senators to claim a construction of that character if they think that it is not violative of the clear terms and of the unquestioned intention of article 4. But I have insisted that even if there was a possibility that any nation on earth would claim such a right in this body, limited to nine members, it would still be equivalent to an impossibility, because it would be impossible to conceive that every one of these representatives on the council would be willing to vote to allow Canada, Australia, or other British dominion membership in the council in addition to the British Empire as a whole, and I do not think that anyone can by any possibility construe, or rather misconstrue, the instrument in such a way as would allow this to be done except by a unanimous vote.

The Senator from Idaho says, referring to my argument:

But while the Senator was denouncing those who were opposing this provision in the covenant for misrepresentation, he left out of his review an entire paragraph which covered the subject he was dealing with, and which permitted the addition of four or five members to the council.

And then he calls attention to article 4, paragraph 1.

But, Mr. President, this is the very paragraph that I have been considering. It is the very paragraph which I declare neither in spirit nor in terms allows both the Empire as a whole and the constituent parts to be represented in the council. But even here the Senator from Idaho has inadvertently, or with that degree of carelessness which so often becomes the characteristic of the orator, used words in reference to this paragraph that are not at all applicable to that paragraph, when he says:

Which—

Referring to this paragraph—

permitted the addition of four or five members to the council.

This paragraph does not admit any added number of members to the council. It simply says that—

These four members of the league shall be selected by the assembly from time to time in its discretion.

That means the four already included in the temporary class, which four may from time to time be changed by the assembly. It does not mean an addition of 4 or 5, making 13 or 14 States represented.

The paragraph relating to added members is the second paragraph, and not the one quoted; and it is this paragraph which, I insist, can not by any possibility be construed to allow the inclusion of representatives from Canada, because this paragraph reads:

With the approval of the majority of the assembly the council may name additional members of the league whose representatives shall always be members of the council.

And—

The council with like approval may increase the members of the league to be selected by the assembly for representation on the council.

That is the provision relating to added members of the league, which members may become members of the council.

I have tried to call attention to the fact that when this paragraph says "the council may name additional members of the league," it necessarily must mean members in addition to those who are now members of the league. Otherwise, you would not have the word "additional." You would have simply declared, "The council may name members of the league whose representatives shall always be members of the council." If it had so read, then there would be some ground for contention that Canada might be selected under this second paragraph.

Labor as earnestly as you are capable of doing, you can not make this word "additional" relate to anything but members of the league; and in the second clause of that second paragraph we have exactly the same thing. It reads:

The council with like approval may increase the number of members of the league.

Instead of saying "may add to the membership," it says "may increase the number of members of the league." You can not increase the number of members of the league except by adding to the number those which at present are outside the number included. And, Mr. President, inasmuch as all these dominions are at present included as members of the league, you can not add them to the members of the league. You can not increase the number of members of the league by adding those which are already members, and under this second paragraph it is only these added members that can be selected for representation either in the permanent or in the temporary group of representatives constituting the council.

Now, Mr. President, I want to call attention to another declaration of the Senator from Idaho relating to my argument, in which he says:

I thought I could detect an inconsistency in the able Senator's argument, because with great effect he argued that these separate colonies had made such sacrifices in the war that it was nothing less than a wrong for us to deny them all the rights of other members of the league. But he finally concluded his argument by saying that the sacrifices which they made, the loss of their men, the fight which they made for the civilization of the world, will be satisfied by a position in an assembly without power, and where they can do nothing but debate.

Mr. President, I have never used words purporting anything of the kind, either in the Senate or out of the Senate. I have never for once questioned that Canada and Australia and all of these other British dominions have the same right to vote that any other country would have under the like condition. All I have claimed is, first, that they can not vote—and, if Senators think they can, that we ought to make it clear that they can not vote—where the British Empire or any of its constituent parts are parties to the dispute; and, secondly, that the only thing that is ever to be submitted either to the council or to the assembly in relation to disputes is the determination of what constitutes the disputes, and also, in addition to that, what recommendation should be made. Upon that, and where neither Great Britain nor Canada nor any of the parts of the British Empire were parties to the disputes, of course, Canada or Australia would have the same vote as any other member. I have never claimed that this was merely a debating society. I admit that possibly a great deal of it will be such, but the right to determine the facts is clearly given in the instrument itself.

Mr. President, I do not care about going over this ground any further. I think I have made my position clear as to what can be determined in the council and in the assembly. I am certain that there is no power to arbitrate given to either the council or the assembly. There is no power to pass judgment. There is a power and a right and a duty, when a dispute comes before either of these bodies, first to attempt to settle it. The first duty of either the council or the assembly, when a dispute reaches either of those bodies, is to attempt to secure an agreement between the parties.

If they fail in that persuasive endeavor, then the next and the only step they can take is to investigate and report the facts and make a recommendation upon those facts. If those things do not bring about a settlement, then the provision is that the matter must go back to the individual members outside of the league, and they agree to use their own best endeavors to bring about a settlement; and, in addition to that, my own insistence is that where a member of the British Empire is a party to the dispute it takes in the entire Empire.

I admit that Senators may justly disagree with me upon that; and they claim that Mr. Borden disagrees with me upon that, and that the letter of Mr. Wilson and Clemenceau and Lloyd-George is in disagreement. I have referred to that before. While I do not claim to know everything that preceded this letter, and what the argument was, I simply say that the letter does not say any such thing; that is all. All the letter says is that—

We concur in his view that upon the true construction of the first and second paragraphs of that article—

Article 4—

representatives of the self-governing dominions of the British Empire may be selected or named as members of the council.

It does not say that they may be selected in addition to other representatives from any part of the British Empire.

It may be, as has been suggested, that there is something back of this in previous declarations and correspondence which would justify the conclusion that that was what was intended, and that this letter therefore meant that Canada could have a representative independent of Great Britain. All I can say in answer to that is that it is contrary both to the spirit and to the letter of the agreement in reference to representation upon the council, and the single vote of the British Empire, equal only to that of France and the United States and Japan

and Italy, as members whose representatives are entitled to vote in the council.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that much is to be gained, if anything, by continuing the discussion with the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. He has repeated the argument which he made some days ago, to which I attempted to make reply, and has not, as I view his presentation, either modified his position or added anything in support of his contention heretofore made. I desire, however, to refer very briefly to what I consider the most important feature of the argument of the able Senator, and that is as to whether the colonies and dominions can become members of the council.

So far as I know, the Senator from North Dakota is the only one now contending that they can not become members of the council. The position was taken at one time by other Members of the Senate, and perhaps by advocates throughout the country, that they could not become members of the council under the terms of the covenant; but after the letter published over the signatures of the President, Mr. Clemenceau, and Lloyd-George, and after the statement by Mr. Borden and Gen. Smuts, and upon further investigation, so far as I know, it is no longer contended that the representatives of the dominions may not become members of the council. They fall back upon the proposition that it would be impracticable for them to secure the votes to do so. But with that, Mr. President, we have very little to do, because all that rests in the future, and depends upon combinations and conditions which we can not very well foresee or forecast. I am only concerned, Mr. President, with the question whether, according to the letter of the covenant itself, they have a right to be members of the council, in case they can secure the votes, as other nations can become members of the council; and, as I said, so far as I know, the Senator from North Dakota is the only one now contending that the covenant prohibits them from becoming members of the council.

Before I take up that particular question, however, may I say a word with reference to the suggestion of the Senator that I seemed to call in question his motives in advocating a league; and what I say applies to all others advocating a league. The question of motives here does not come within the domain of debate. It is a subject which I do not discuss. I question no colleague's motives in the discharge of his duties here. Whatever I may think about it, it is not a subject for debate. Men may do very wise things from very bad motives and very unwise things from very good motives. It is the effect of the act and the contention with which we are concerned here and which is a matter of legitimate debate, and that alone concerns us in the discussions here. So if anything has been said upon my part either with reference to the Senator from North Dakota or any other Senator which would seem to imply a challenge of any man's motives in pursuing this or that course or supporting this or that proposition it is aside from any intention of mine to have it so construed. As to the effect of a vote which may be cast or a contention which is made and as to whether that is in harmony with what I conceive to be the best interests of the country, that is a subject of legitimate debate and may be a subject of very intense conviction.

There is a wide disparity between the opponents of this amendment. The Senator from North Dakota in opening his remarks a few days ago stated that he proposed to show two things: First, that this amendment was unnecessary in order to protect the equality of power or influence of the United States in the league, and, secondly, that if it were adopted it would be a grave injustice to the dominions and colonies of Great Britain by reason of the position which they had occupied in the war and the sacrifices which they had sustained. On the other hand, during the last two days of the debate it has been contended with great earnestness that the amendment does not effectuate any change at all, as it were; that it does not accomplish the shearing of power from the dominions.

Mr. President, I do not think this amendment accomplishes by any means a full equality of power and influence, but it goes further and effectuates more than any other proposition which has been submitted to me or which has come under my observation, and, so far as I am concerned, I desire to vote for an amendment which will go as far as an amendment may, and then I shall vote for the reservation if upon final reflection I conclude that the reservation accomplishes more along a different line or in any way adds to our strength in the league.

But I call the attention now of those who are advocating a reservation to what I conceive to be the distinction, and which with all due respect to those who are advocating it seems to me is not founded upon so solid a basis as the amendment. As I understand the reservation, whatever it accomplishes it accom-

plishes by eliminating the dominions from a vote in the assembly or wherever they may be found in the league. In other words, we reduce the British Empire, under the reservation, in case we are dissatisfied with any decision, to a unit, and will not hold ourselves down by any action which may be taken wherein more than one vote was cast by the British Empire. That has the effect of eliminating the dominions entirely.

I do not object at all, and never have objected, to the dominions having their vote in the league, provided that it can be equalized by the vote or the influence, the prestige or power, by reason of the vote, of the United States. I think that the dominions, owing to the peculiar construction of the British Empire, may well contend for that which they have contended for and are entitled to much consideration in regard to that. But, Mr. President, if the amendment should be defeated and the plan to add additional votes and power to the United States should fail, the next best alternative undoubtedly, so far as our interests are concerned, is to shear away the power of the British Empire and deprive her of the votes of her colonies in these emergencies.

Mr. President, this entire question can be simplified and better understood if we will realize the dual capacity which the dominions occupy in this scheme of a world league. In the first place, as dominions of the British Empire, they are bound to the British Empire, and are under certain obligations and sustain a certain relationship to the British Empire, which deprives them of their sovereignty, of their nationhood. They are at most qualified nations or qualified sovereigns. They are not complete, independent entities, so far as the British Empire is concerned. But for the purpose of organizing the league of nations they take an entirely different position. While they are dominions in the British Empire they are separate and independent nations in the league of nations; and they occupy the positions therefore of complete, dual entities, as it were, one being circumstanced and conditioned by reason of the relations to the British Empire and the other a wholly different proposition, by reason of the attitude which they assume in the league.

I call attention to Mr. Borden's statement, which makes that very plain. I referred to a portion of this the other day, but not to this particular paragraph. He said:

Each nation must preserve unimpaired its absolute autonomy, but it must likewise have its voice as to those external relations which involve the issue of peace or of war. So that the Britannic Commonwealth is in itself a community or league of nations which may serve as an exemplar to that world-wide league of nations which was founded on the 28th of last June.

Whatever may be her attitude toward the British league, they would not permit it to be left in doubt as to what their position should be in the league of nations.

Can the dominions become members of the council? There is nothing in the league of nations which inhibits their being members of the council. They can be elected if they can find the votes, just the same as any other power. As the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] stated a few minutes ago, they have signed the league, they have signed the treaty, and they stand in just the same position, having all the rights and privileges under the league as any other nation.

Suppose Canada was a candidate for membership in the council. What clause would you draw upon her? What provision of the league would you present to her which would say to Canada, "You can not be a candidate; you are ineligible"?

What phrase or paragraph can you point to that would fix her ineligibility? You might say to her, "I will not vote for you, notwithstanding your right to be elected." But you might say that to Belgium or Serbia or any other country. But what clause would the Senator from North Dakota point to in the league and say, "You are not eligible at all to membership here, and therefore can not be a candidate; I could not vote for you if I wanted to"? There is no such clause. Canada could well say, "I stand in precisely the same position as the United States or Serbia or Belgium or Greece or Brazil or any other country. Why should I be excluded from the council?"

Then you would have to reply, "For no other reason in the world than that we think it would be unwise for you to be there, not because the covenant prohibits it."

Mind you, before we say that, before we shall have declared to Canada that we think she ought not to be a member, we have signed the league which gives her the right to be a member.

So, Mr. President, I do not think it can be contended that, so far as the terms of the covenant are concerned, it can be said that Australia or New Zealand or Canada are ineligible as candidates.

What does Gen. Smuts say about that? He makes it very plain, and Gen. Smuts is one of the great outstanding figures of this war, not only a man of transcendent ability but he has disclosed more independence of thought and more courage, I

will not say that any man who was at Versailles—but it was so pronounced that it was commented on throughout the world. Everyone will remember the speech which Gen. Smuts made in England before he left for South Africa, in which he told the English people that they had to settle the Irish question, that they had to settle their internal matters, and that the quicker they did so the sooner the British Empire would be at ease and enjoy the tranquillity which she was entitled to enjoy.

So upon every occasion and under all circumstances he has never hesitated to say what was in his mind with the utmost freedom. Everyone will remember that when he left Versailles the declaration which he made to the world required some courage to make under the circumstances, when he said—I am not quoting his exact language, but the substance—that the aspirations of the human family, the things which had nerved the people of the world to pay out their money and shed their blood without stint were not written in this treaty. So he has spoken upon all occasions and under all circumstances as a man who was giving utterance to the things which he believed to be true. He said:

Regarding the league of nations, it was incorrect to say that in the league the British Empire was a unit. The empire was a group, but South Africa had exactly the same rights and voice as England. Though England was a permanent member of the central council, South Africa could be elected to that council.

That is the understanding of Gen. Smuts, who was there. Aye, indeed, that is the understanding of the man who framed the first league of nations, upon which this league was built. That is the position which is occupied by Borden. I am not going to take time to reread it. I read it into my remarks the other day. But Mr. Borden contended from the very beginning that the dominions should occupy a place in the league which will enable them to enjoy all the rights of the league, notwithstanding the fact that Great Britain might, as a unit, be holding a position in the league, in the council, or elsewhere.

Now, having the views of those two men, who are in a position to know, let us look again at this letter which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] refines away:

The question having been raised as to the meaning of article 4 of the league of nations covenant, we have been requested by Sir Robert Borden to state whether we concur in his view that upon the true construction of the first and second paragraphs of that article representatives of the self-governing dominions of the British Empire may be selected or named as members of the council.

Not representatives from the dominions for the British Empire, but representatives of the dominions, may be selected as members upon the council. The Senator from North Dakota would have us believe that Borden and Smuts set about to secure a construction which would enable Great Britain, if she chose to do so, or the British Empire, to select the permanent membership from some of the dominions, but representing all the time the British Empire. Can anyone think that they deemed it necessary to have a construction which would permit Great Britain to select her representatives from any part of her dominions from which she chose to select them? That was not the contention. The contention was that, notwithstanding the British Empire had its member upon the council, the dominions, in addition to that membership, should have a position upon the council, and that was the construction which was placed upon it by Borden and Smuts, and it is the construction of this letter:

We have no hesitation in expressing our entire concurrence in this view.

That is the view entertained by Borden, which is made clear by his statement published a short time ago and now in the Record, to wit, that the dominions have a separate entity.

If there were any doubt it would be entirely removed by the fact that the articles are not subject to a narrow and technical construction.

All parties, therefore, who are in position to know what the intent of the framers was have construed this in accordance with the proposition that the dominions may have members of the council, and when we take into consideration that they are full members of the league, that they stand there as separate signers of the league, that there is no inhibition in the league against their being members of the council, that there is no curtailment of their privileges in the league, it seems to me that there can no longer be any contention that they may be members of the council and have a right to be the same as anyone else.

Mr. President, this question of whether or not the dominions could become members of the council is very important. It is one of those matters which might be easily settled if there were any doubt about it left in the minds of anyone. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is in touch with the League to Enforce Peace, and the League to Enforce Peace are in touch with the British authorities as to their construc-

tion of this league, and they are in confidential communication with them from day to day, and I have some telegrams in my possession which show that. If it were thought advisable, it seems to me that the view of the leading authorities in England upon this question might be had. I venture to say that you will not find the premier of England, or any of those who represent the Government, admitting for a moment that the dominions may not be members of the council. If the information could not be secured in that way the construction or contention of the British authorities could be secured through diplomatic channels. It is a thing which need not be left in doubt. If the authorities of Great Britain are willing to concede the contention of such able gentlemen as the Senator from North Dakota, that can be known; but in view of the fact that Mr. Borden says the premier led the fight for the contention which he made, and that he has placed his construction upon that contention, and that Gen. Smuts, who assisted him in making the fight, has placed his construction upon it, until we hear further from those authorities we must conclude that that is the contention which they are going to make within the league. If they make that contention and secure that construction, what possible remedy have we? There is no appeal from the decisions which these powers shall make. There is no one to construe it after they have construed it. The league construes its own powers and augments and increases or diminishes its powers as it may see fit, and no one can challenge it and no one can correct it.

The only remedy that can possibly be had is a remedy that is had before we enter the league. Therefore these amendments and these reservations which are placing constructions upon the covenant, which are to go in and constitute and form a part of the covenant, and therefore be binding.

But, however able may be the Senator from North Dakota, he would have to admit that if there is nothing found in the way of a construction except his speech, if his speech is not reduced to an amendment or a reservation, little attention will be given to it when the league convenes in Geneva. Here, with 32 different nations ratifying this league, all of them construing it in different ways, there is no safety in construction except to reduce it to a clause and put it in the covenant itself where it will have effect.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I will not delay even for 10 minutes the action of the Senate on the pending amendment. I have been ready and extremely anxious to vote on this and every other provision of the treaty and covenant for a long time. I am not complaining because other Senators have spoken long and frequently on this most important international agreement. I have listened with most profound interest to much of what has been said, and I have no patience with those people who have practically advised the Senate to sign in blank what the President has presented to the Senate, which is one of the two coordinate branches of the treaty-making powers of the Government. I am confident that study and discussion has enlightened public sentiment, and that through proper reservations our country is going to be saved from some of the imminently possible dangers which indifference, carelessness, and inability allowed to be inserted in the treaty and attached covenant. Some day the people of the United States will realize the truth of this statement. Every honest, intelligent man understands that the preceding document is almost hopelessly, if not wickedly, involved in doubt. It has been almost impossible to determine its meaning and its possible results. I have had grave doubts which I have conscientiously endeavored to solve; but when I have not succeeded in making the provisions clear to my mind, I have resolved the doubt in favor of our country.

For many years I have felt it was our duty to take a prominent part in securing cooperation with other nations of the world to prevent unjust war and to preserve a righteous peace. I had fondly hoped that at the end of this awful war the great opportunity for such cooperation would be improved. That opportunity has been lost to a large degree by this abortive agreement which is before us. The President has been overreached by the Allies, who knew and obtained what they wanted. The interests and welfare of the United States seem to have been overlooked or disregarded. It is now more than ordinarily the duty of the Senate to secure as far as possible such rights and welfare.

I do not believe that we should reject the treaty or render inoperative anything that is good and desirable in the covenant. The latter does at least furnish some opportunity for a workable understanding looking to the preservation of peace, and it does contain some things which should be retained.

I have quite consistently voted against amendments to the treaty for reasons which I have heretofore given and which I will not now repeat.

The pending amendment is, in my judgment, different in principle and effect from the others. It is largely sentimental; but, sir, it is the sentiment of patriotism and national respect, and I will not allow any occasion to pass without expressing my disapproval of any suggestion, even, certainly not of any international recognition, that the United States, which so unselfishly and so effectively sacrificed its boys and treasure in the war, is of less importance than any other nation in the world. The league covenant does contemptibly recognize such inferiority.

The pending amendment does not entirely place our country in the position I would like to have it occupy. It does, however, resent the insult which the covenant implies and it announces the doctrine which the world accepts, viz, that the United States is second to no nation on earth. Other nations have the same rights to equality as have the British Empire and the United States. If they are content with the position as to voting power in which the covenant places them, I probably would have little cause to complain. It is my solemn duty here and now to defend my country against slight and danger, and this I propose to perform by voting on this and every other occasion for any pertinent measure which recognizes the equality of this Republic among the nations.

Who can object to this? Will the little democracies, who recognize the United States as their hope and salvation and for whom the friends of a league are so solicitous? Evidently not. Will the British Empire? No. But if she does, will she not thereby acknowledge that she desires to retain an advantage to which she is not entitled and which may be injurious if not disastrous to our country? But as for myself, sir, while I am somewhat indifferent to what other nations may think about this matter, I am deeply interested in what the people of the United States may think, and I must have the approval of my own conscience.

I regret more than I can tell that so much harsh, intemperate criticism has been indulged against some of our associates in this war. They rendered invaluable service in saving civilization. They have, as it was their national duty to do, looked after the welfare of their own countries. I feel that our welfare and, in this particular case our honor, have been neglected. I shall do what I can to correct that wrong and at the same time to preserve whatever is good in the covenant as the beginning, at least, of our effort to establish peace and righteousness in the world.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent that we may vote upon the pending amendments before adjournment or recess to-day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Hale	McNary	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Harding	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Harris	Nelson	Smoot
Chamberlain	Harrison	New	Spencer
Colt	Henderson	Newberry	Sterling
Culberson	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Nugent	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Townsend
Dial	Kellogg	Owen	Trammell
Dillingham	Kendrick	Page	Underwood
Edge	Keyes	Penrose	Wadsworth
Fernald	King	Polindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Kirby	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
France	Knox	Robinson	Watson
Gay	La Follette	Sheppard	
Gerry	Lenroot	Shields	
Gore	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are detained by illness in their families. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote upon the two pending amendments before recess or adjournment to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I object. The reason why I object is because the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has telephoned that he desires to be heard upon this amendment,

that he is sick and unable to be here, and I insist that he shall have an opportunity.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I then ask unanimous consent that not later than the adjournment or recess on the calendar day of Monday next the Senate proceed to vote upon the pending amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator state the request again?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In view of the objection made by the Senator from California, I amend my request and ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to vote upon the so-called Johnson amendments, which have been pending for about a week, not later than the close of the session on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, being uncertain as to the number of Senators who may desire to be heard upon the question, I should be very glad to enter into that unanimous-consent agreement, so far as personally I could, if it were fixed for Tuesday. I have been told that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] desires to speak upon the subject. I am not entirely clear as to his wishes. I know that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] desires to speak at length. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] has told me that he desires to speak. I think they ought to be accorded the opportunity. Will not Tuesday be satisfactory?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have made the unanimous-consent request, and I ask to have it put. If some one objects—

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I object, then, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, Mr. President, I ask that not later than the close of the calendar day of Tuesday the Senate will proceed to vote upon the pending amendments.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suppose the Senator desires to call attention to the fact that the Senate is to receive the King of the Belgians on Tuesday.

Mr. LODGE. No; the Senator is no doubt a mind reader, but that was not my purpose.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I had that in mind, and I supposed possibly the Senator was about to mention it. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. My purpose was to suggest that when we agree on a time to vote, which I hope we shall do, we fix a definite hour, 5 o'clock.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator mean by that that we might vote on any other day not later than 5 o'clock?

Mr. LODGE. That we vote on this amendment—that is all that is asked for—not later than 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will make that request, then, that the Senate give unanimous consent that a vote shall be taken upon the pending amendments, the so-called Johnson amendments—

Mr. WATSON. And any amendments thereto. There are some amendments, I understand.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I would include that—on Tuesday, not later than 5 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, that being the suggestion I made a moment ago, I am very glad to accede to it so far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. LODGE. I hope it will be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the agreement as proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Senate will vote upon what are known as the Johnson amendments, and any amendments thereto, to the treaty of peace with Germany, page 19, after line 17, at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, October 28, 1919.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the agreement as proposed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I understand that that includes both the amendments that are connected with each other. One is known as the Johnson amendment, and the other as the Moses amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again state the agreement that is proposed, so that there may be no misunderstanding in regard to it.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I do not know that it is necessary in this same connection, but I propose to offer an amendment, similar in nature to those that have been discussed, to section 5; and I will offer it now if the Senator from Nebraska prefers, so that he may understand what it is, and, if he desires, include it in his request for a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that would hardly be in order. The Senate has already agreed by unanimous consent to vote first of all upon the committee amendments, of which these two constitute a part; and, as I understand, the Senator's amendment is a personal amendment which is entirely separate from these, although it may have a similar purpose.

Mr. SHIELDS. It is practically the same.

Mr. LODGE. And it will be in order after voting on the committee amendments.

Mr. SHIELDS. It relates to the same article.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It will be in order, then, after the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The committee amendments can be amended, I understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Tuesday, October 28, 1919, at not later than 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate will vote upon the amendment known as the Johnson amendment and the amendment known as the Moses amendment to the treaty of peace with Germany, and on any amendment that may be offered to either.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, from statements that have already been made as to the Senators who propose to speak upon this amendment, I am quite sure that it is proposed to fix a date entirely too early. I desire to make a speech myself upon this amendment, and I object to the proposed agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I renew the request, but asking to have the vote taken Wednesday, at not later than 5 o'clock. I ask to have that submitted.

Mr. LODGE. I was about to do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the request as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

That on the calendar day of Wednesday, October 29, 1919, at not later than 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon what are known as the Johnson and Moses amendments proposed to the treaty of peace with Germany, and upon any amendments that may be offered to either; and will dispose of the said amendments before adjournment on the said calendar day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to have an opportunity to speak upon the pending amendments. It has been my experience and observation that as soon as the bar of unanimous consent is put up on further debate it immediately creates a desire to be heard upon the part of quite a large number of Senators who had theretofore not intended to participate in the debate upon the question. I am apprehensive that in violation of our standing rule a list will be made at the desk for recognition, in conformity with a practice that has come to be quite uniform on occasions such as this, where the debate is limited; and unless one is fortunate enough to get his name on the list early, he is likely to be excluded from being heard at all. While I suppose that the debate upon these pending amendments might easily be concluded before the time asked to be fixed, I wish to speak especially, Mr. President, to the labor provisions of the treaty while this amendment is pending, because those provisions are profoundly affected by the discrepancy in the voting strength and the voting power of this country and Great Britain, and therefore all that I have to say is very pertinent to the pending amendment, though I also expect to broadly discuss the effect of these labor provisions.

Under the circumstances, I hope that the Senator from Nebraska will not press for unanimous consent to conclude the debate upon the pending amendments. I was in hopes that I might speak this afternoon, but I find now that it is impossible for me to get from the typewriter the notes which I have made for this discussion, and I am constrained, Mr. President, to object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator objects, I would like to have an opportunity to amend my request so that I might meet his objection. I would add to the request made for voting on Wednesday a clause that beginning on the calendar day of Tuesday no Senator speak more than one hour. That will give everybody a chance, and the Senator from Wisconsin can be recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That would not quite enable me to complete my address. I have exactly 59 pages of manuscript upon this subject, and it will take me two hours and a half, I think, to finish the address.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I will amend it so as to except the Senator from Wisconsin, who shall be allowed three hours. We are all very anxious to hear the Senator, I am sure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I will not consent to any arrangement that designates me by name in its terms. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I regret that the Senate did not agree to fix a time. I am inclined to think that if we put off voting on these amendments as long as Wednesday it will be put off much longer than necessary. As we have not been able to reach a unanimous-consent agreement, I only desire now to say that I shall move a recess this afternoon until Monday, and I shall endeavor to hold the Senate in session as long as Senators will stay here with me.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SHIELDS. I desire to offer an amendment to article 4 of the treaty. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let it be read.

Mr. SHIELDS. It is short, and I will ask that the Secretary may read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendment proposed to article 4 of the treaty with Germany, to follow the same and constitute a part of that article.

Provided further, That when imperial and federal governments and their self-governing dominions, colonies, or states are members of the league, as originally organized or hereafter admitted, the empire or federal government and the dominions, colonies, or states shall, collectively, have only one membership, one delegate, and one vote in the council, and only three delegates and one vote in the assembly.

Mr. SHIELDS. I ask that the amendment be printed with the other reservations and amendments for the use of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, no Member of the Senate regrets our inability to reach an agreement for a final vote upon these amendments more earnestly than myself. Had we been able to do so, I would cheerfully forego any discussion of these amendments. But in view of the objections just interposed, I shall occupy your attention for a brief period regarding them.

Mr. President, I have not been able to attribute to the representation provided in the structure of Part I of the treaty the importance which it seems to occupy in the minds of many Senators. I have discovered in my examination of the covenant several serious and one or two apparently insoluble obstacles to its acceptance. It may be that I have attributed too much importance to other parts of the treaty, and thus made the mistake that seems to me to have been made by others concerning the subject matter of these amendments.

I am not aware that when this particular feature of the covenant of the league was under consideration at Paris objection from any source was expressed against the arrangement. Some time last February we received the original draft of the proposed covenant, at which time many criticisms were made of it, but I do not recall this objection was one of them. I heard a number of very able criticisms of that draft on the floor of this body; I read many strong magazine and newspaper articles in adverse comment upon it; I received a great many personal communications concerning it. I do not remember that in any of these discussions, articles, or communications was objection made, much less elaborated, against the preponderant power of the British Empire in the counsels of the league. Of course, Mr. President, that circumstance, if properly stated, is no argument for or against the proposition, but it indicates, if true, that its importance has since that time been largely exaggerated.

I do not for a moment question the soundness of the proposition that in all matters of dispute or of difference which may arise hereafter, and coming within the jurisdiction of the league, which concern the United States directly, no member of the assembly should have a preponderant vote or influence as compared with any other. I do not believe that anyone will successfully challenge the soundness of that proposition, which seems self-evident. Moreover, that is the only rule which squares with fairness and justice. So far, then, as that feature of the amendment is concerned, I am in hearty sympathy with it. I think there is and can be no doubt that every delegate to the assembly representing a member of the league has the same

power and authority, the same eligibility to a seat in the council, and the same attributes which are common to every other member.

It makes no difference whether this delegate represents a colony, a dependency, or an independent sovereign power. The equilibrium is destroyed the moment any difference in authority or eligibility is recognized. In my judgment, delegates to the assembly representing India or either of the four self-governing dominions of the British Empire, or all of them together, if you please, are entirely qualified for membership in the council.

While I have the highest regard for the opinion of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], I am unable to accept his reasoning upon this subject. But, Mr. President, the question is largely an academic one, for the reason that unanimity of action on the part of the members composing the council is absolutely essential to their election to the council, as it is to the election of a representative of any other nation to that body. In other words, from a practical view of the situation, there is no possibility of the selection of such a delegate to the council, for the very good reason that Italy, France, and, in all probability, Japan, would be quite as much concerned in preventing an undue preponderance in the council in favor of any nation as would be the United States. But, if the fact were otherwise, the interposition of a single objecting vote precludes the possibility of the addition of such a member to the council or the selection of such a member in place of a nation now represented upon it. So we are spending much time in discussing a situation which, from a practical point of view, seems to be wholly negligible.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] a day or two ago occupied some time in establishing, from the Borden correspondence and from other sources of information, the complete independence of the representatives of all of the self-governing dominions as members of the council. I think his argument, while perfect, proved too much, for, assuming such a complete independence, it must follow that they can only be subservient to the British Empire through motives of friendship, or because of an interest which is quite as likely to manifest itself in any other representative. They are either independent of Great Britain or they are not. If they are independent, then their adhesion to the cause of the Empire in times of crisis is determined, not upon the element of dependence, but upon identity of interest or of understanding or of amity or of any of the other influences which might be equally controlling with any other member of the league.

No man contends, Mr. President, no man can contend successfully, that there is or should be any difference whatever in the assembly between the status of representatives of self-governing dominions and that of representatives of any other country. If I am right, then the question of influence or of preponderant power operating as a menace to the people of the United States, in my judgment, disappears.

I have stated these conclusions, Mr. President, somewhat clumsily, perhaps inaccurately, but they are to me convincing of the comparative unimportance of the objection except in so far as the contingency might materialize against the United States in some difficulty or dispute directly between ourselves and Great Britain or some sovereignty with which that Empire had very close treaty relations.

I listened with much pleasure and instruction to the address of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROTH] upon these amendments a few days ago. He contended that, conceding to the Johnson amendment all the need for it that its author claimed, it did not accomplish the purpose which he had in mind, did not invest the United States with five additional votes, and did not create that equilibrium of conditions which, of course, is the object of the amendment. I have never listened to a clearer, more logical, and convincing presentation of a proposition in my life. He elaborated the subject, and so much better than I can, that I perhaps should apologize for discussing the subject at all. He demonstrated, with the precision of a problem in Euclid, the impossibility of meeting the real objection, which we must consider, by the adoption of anything less than a reservation directly aimed at the difficulty, such, for example, as presented by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] or that which was presented by the Senator himself. Of course, it would be grossly improper for any dependency of the British Empire, for any self-governing dominion of that country, to identify itself as an additional unit in the league of nations with respect to any question concerning either the Empire or any of its constituencies. It would be as inappropriate as the service upon a jury of a kinsman of one of the litigants. It is the part of statesmanship for this country to guard against such a possibility, since human nature is apt

to be the same in transactions involving the fate of nations as it is in those which merely involve the interests of individuals. The urge of race is sometimes irresistible, and the urge of necessity, when in community, is equally strong. We can not afford, therefore, to permit this treaty to be ratified without expressly safeguarding ourselves—and in doing that we are doing justice to our associates as well as to ourselves—against a possibility of a preponderance of interest passing judgment upon any subject or problem which may affect us adversely to Great Britain or any of her dependencies. Since that situation can be met, and is, in my judgment, fully met by the so-called McCumber amendment, and does not seem to be met by the amendments, it is the part of wisdom and sound statesmanship to include in our ratification a reservation clause such as I have described.

I think, too, Mr. President, that we should consider how other nations may view our guardianship and protectorate of certain members of the league located in the Western Hemisphere, for we can not suspect Great Britain of designedly packing the assembly, so to speak, with a view of safeguarding her own interests. We can not criticize her control of Persia and of Hedjaz without laying ourselves open to similar imputations and equally just criticisms when our relations with certain countries to the south of us are considered.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. I have heard the suggestion made upon several different occasions that the United States would be as much warranted in relying upon the vote of certain nations to the south as Great Britain would upon the votes of her colonies. Does the Senator himself indulge in that belief for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President; but I think it is quite as pertinent and quite as just for Great Britain and, perhaps, other nations to lay that imputation at our door as it is for us to lay them at the doors of Great Britain and other countries.

Mr. FALL. I was curious to know whether any Senator here really believes it.

Mr. THOMAS. Frankly, I do not know.

Mr. FALL. Then, I might suggest this to the Senator: Great Britain has an interest in her colonies and there is, to put it in the weakest form, an alliance between the self-governing dominions and Great Britain; their interests are, to a great extent, identical. That is a fact. It is an equally well-established fact, as to which if any doubt is entertained by any Senator the proof is available, that the United States of America has within four years made a proposition to the nations to the south of us that they should enter into an alliance with this country, the basis of the alliance being the basis of this treaty—what the President of the United States has said is the heart of the treaty—and it is also an established fact that each of those nations rejected the proposition, while the British colonies or the British self-governing dominions, which are a portion of the British Empire, have adhered to the British alliance.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from New Mexico is now speaking of alliances. I had no thought of an alliance between the United States and countries to the south of us, but of alleged control over them.

Mr. FALL. But the Senator was saying that it might be urged that the United States could be criticized because of the fact that certain nations to the south would be controlled by the United States in their votes, as the British colonies might be controlled by Great Britain. The two cases are not at all parallel; and I am wondering if there is a Senator here who believes that the United States could count upon the vote of those countries.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think there is a parallel. Let us take Panama, for example. That nation is the bastard offspring of the Roosevelt administration. It was the outgrowth of the resentment of that administration against the Senate of the Colombian Republic, because it assumed to exercise the same power to change a treaty that we are now asserting. Without the support of this Government Panama never would have come into existence in all probability, and without that support she certainly would have received no recognition from the great powers across the sea; at least, it would not have received recognition as promptly as it was given. It is entirely under the influence of the United States.

Now, if the Senator from New Mexico asks me whether I believe that any attempt would be made by the United States to influence the vote of Panama in the league assembly as to any matter affecting our interests, I answer promptly, "No." I have too high an opinion of the honor and the dignity of my country to assume that for a moment; and I am equally charitable in believing that Great Britain would, under similar circumstances, disdain to influence the representatives of Persia or Hedjaz. It may be that my altruism is altogether too idealistic.

tic, but there is certainly just as much basis for one assumption as for the other.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. FALL. What basis is there for the assumption that the United States would have any reason to influence those votes? The United States has nothing to protect; the United States acquires no territory; the United States acquires affirmatively nothing, while under this treaty Great Britain acquires practically the earth. Great Britain would have a reason possibly for influencing votes, while the United States would have none whatsoever in so far as material or selfish interests are concerned.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can not look very far into the future; but inasmuch as this entire discussion is based upon the assumption that the United States may become involved in disputes or differences against which she must safeguard herself now, I must assume that some such disputes or differences will ultimately arise.

The United States gave Cuba its independence and has virtually exercised a protectorate over that island ever since. At one time it became our duty to retake possession of Cuba and administer her affairs until order was again restored. The people of Cuba naturally feel under the greatest obligations to the United States, not only because we aided in securing their freedom but also because we give them special consideration in our tariff laws; they enjoy a degree of reciprocity that is very valuable to them and which is also peculiar to them.

The Government of Nicaragua stands, and has rested for years, on the bayonets of the United States marines. To remove them would virtually invite the collapse of that Government. That is known and realized better in Nicaragua than it is here; for down there even a suggestion that we withdraw our marines would cause political and social panic throughout the Republic, if it is a Republic. Consequently, in some great controversy that may in the future intrude itself upon our affairs, I can see no reason why our adversary should not regard our relations with such a country with the same suspicion that we regard, or assume to regard, those of Great Britain with other countries.

What is true of Nicaragua is true of Haiti. That Government since the year 1913 has been virtually under our control, and has prospered accordingly. We have, then, in a political sense, and probably in an economic sense, four dependencies in this hemisphere which are as much subjects to us and to our influence as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the South African Union are to the influence of the British Empire.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. With pleasure.

Mr. FALL. The Senator indicates that so long as we have marines in Nicaragua we might be able to count upon our influence availing something with the vote of Nicaragua; that because—

Mr. THOMAS. What I meant to say—and what I think I did say—was that it gave to other powers the same reason for suspecting us that the attitude of other countries to Great Britain gives us for suspecting Great Britain.

Mr. FALL. I did not understand; I thought the Senator was suggesting it as his judgment that such would be the case.

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. FALL. It is my mistake. I have no hesitancy in saying that if the Senator thinks by virtue of the fact that we have marines in Haiti we might possibly elect some one from Haiti to sit in the assembly and in that way control the vote of her representatives, I agree with him; if he makes the same statement in reference to Nicaragua, I agree with him; but if the Senator thinks that if it were not for the present peculiar relations between the countries we could count upon the vote of either of those countries I can not agree with him; and I hope that the conditions that exist to-day may not continue for a very great many years.

Mr. THOMAS. Nobody, Mr. President, more cordially joins in the expression of that sentiment than myself. Let me reiterate, in view of the interruption, that I repudiate the view that the Government of the United States would avail or attempt to avail itself of these adventitious conditions. I am trying to press home the fact that if Great Britain lives in a glass house—and perhaps she does—we may occupy the same sort of a mansion in her estimation and that of a great many other members of the league.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. FALL. The Senator understands, I assume, that those who are advocating the Johnson amendment are not attempting to restrict Great Britain as to any influence which she may have either in Persia, in Egypt, or in Mecca and Medina, but that the only purpose is to place the United States upon an equality with what is commonly known as the British Empire, which has votes, as we understand, for her self-governing dominions as well as for herself.

Mr. THOMAS. I know that is the attitude of the Senator and others who favor the amendment, and if I assume their premises I must accept their conclusions.

Mr. President, I am concerned at present merely in giving my view of the situation as explanatory of the vote which I shall cast, if we ever reach a vote. I shall vote against this amendment and for one of the reservations to which I have made reference, my purpose being to accomplish by that means the same end which Senators who are supporting the amendment are seeking to accomplish; in other words, our purpose seems to be mutual, but our methods are variant.

I come now, Mr. President, to the consideration very briefly of the relation of the colonies or self-governing dominions to Great Britain—and let me say by way of digression that I am in full sympathy with the views expressed here regarding the inclusion of India as an independent member of the league. I do not understand it. I know that India was of great service during the war. Her petty princes furnished troops and treasure. Her people made sacrifices for the cause of the Allies that measure up to those which were made by the great powers themselves. Of her loyalty during this war there can be no question, with here and there a possible temporary and short-lived exception. Hence, I conclude that India was given this representation because of the magnitude and the splendor of her service and sacrifice in the Great War against Germany.

That, however, does not answer the objections which are made to the inclusion in the league of the dependency of a country with that country, and upon the same terms. That has been done; and if there were any way of avoiding it by considering India as a separate subject of amendment I confess that I should be somewhat perturbed as to my action. But so far as the self-governing dominions are concerned they are as nearly sovereign as nations can be as to everything except foreign affairs and the nominal allegiance which they owe to the King of Great Britain. If I remember correctly, the governments of these self-governing dominions declared war formally against Germany. Their legislatures certainly voted the money necessary to carry on and pay the expenses of their participation.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. FALL. The idea suggested itself to me that the logic of the Senator's present statement is that while the United States is now a great nation, much more powerful at home and much more powerful in the councils of the nations and of the world because it is a nation and not a confederation of 48 States, in so far as our power in the world is concerned, if we should enter this league we would be much more powerful if we were merely a confederation of the 48 States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not draw that conclusion. Certainly it is far from my intention to say anything upon which such a conclusion could be based, because I have made to that subject no reference whatever. I may say to the Senator, however, that I am unable to perceive how the United States would be more powerful or influential within the league than it would be without it.

Mr. FALL. I agree with the Senator thoroughly there. I think the United States is more than six times as strong out of it as it will be in it, even granting her an equal voting power with Great Britain.

Mr. THOMAS. Without challenging the accuracy of that statement or accepting it, I may say that, in my judgment, if the United States enters this league under a treaty containing part 13, unmodified and unamended, its influence and power will not only be largely diminished but it is merely a question of time when it, with the other nations of the earth, may disappear under the submerging tides of international socialism. But I shall address myself to that part of the treaty when the amendment which the Senator proposes to offer, to strike it out, shall come up for consideration.

Mr. President, Canada and the other self-governing dominions are closely allied with Great Britain. Their first allegiance, outside of their own interest, is to the mother country. It would be strange if it were not so, and particularly in view of their common experiences during the last four and a half years. But these provinces constitute far-flung portions of the British Empire. Great Britain is the mother of self-governing dominions, the great colony nation, because she knows how to

deal with, how to manage, and how to develop colonies, something which no other nation has learned; something which no other nation except our own ever will learn. The American Revolution and its disastrous consequences to England taught the people of that country the most valuable lesson of their history. They learned, by an experience which cost them the loss of their fairest domains, that English-speaking people and Anglo-Saxon races must exercise and enjoy the privilege of self-government and will assert it in open rebellion should it be refused by the governing power. Having learned that, she wisely applied it in all instances except one to English-speaking people, with the result that she has builded great communities—great, powerful, intelligent, and free nations—in the four quarters of the globe; and it was well that she did so, for she needed the inspiration of their encouragement and the practical assistance of their soldiers and their money during the recent crisis, in which her very life was imperiled.

But, Mr. President, there are many conditions largely local to these dominions which are more in harmony with American interests, with American points of view, and with American destiny than they are with those of Great Britain, and I think it is a mistake to assume in this discussion the antagonism of these dominions to us and the certainty of their identification with Great Britain as to any matter of dispute that might come between her and ourselves.

Indeed, I have regretted the assumption, frequently made here, of a condition of continued and chronic hostility of Great Britain to America, for all this discussion leads to the conclusion that, as to controversies which may come before the league for consideration or as to affairs which may not be controversial, the interests of Great Britain and those of the United States would be found in conflict or hostile to a greater or less degree. I do not think so. I have believed from the moment we went into this war that the one great security to the future peace of the world would be a mutual and permanent understanding between the English-speaking peoples, possessing as they do the wealth, the greater part of the commerce, the merchant marine, the civilization, and the institutions which make for the happiness of mankind and the prosperity of nations. I think that is a feeling, partly instinctive but nevertheless growing, among thoughtful people upon both sides of the ocean; and the principal faith which I have in this proposed league is the dominance of Great Britain and the United States within its councils, supplemented by the recognition of the nationalities of these great English-speaking dominions. They will be found together in the great majority of instances where league action is required.

Before the war, Mr. President, when international conflicts were discussed, and particularly when the urgency of preparation became one of the active incidents of our congressional life, men mentally visioned some antagonist threatening—perhaps remotely, but nevertheless threatening—the security of the United States. What country was it? The country, Mr. President, which had devoted itself to militarism, which had become the dominant power of the European Continent, which preached war and practiced conquest, whose commerce was extended into every country and whose industrial domination of the world seemed to be but a question of years. It was Germany which instinctively materialized in the public imagination whenever the thought of war or preparation for the national security became the dominant note of public thought and discussion.

Events proved that this instinct was a sure one; that it was neither misplaced nor misdirected. She was not building a fleet which she intended ultimately to surpass that of the British Empire, she was not increasing her land armament from year to year, she was not expanding her sources of military equipment at all times, for nothing. The wonder is, Mr. President, that the world was unprepared for the cataclysm when it came. The wonder is that it should have sat supinely during all the years when every evidence indicated the coming storm, for we saw shortly after that storm broke that it was the culmination of a series of events, every one of which had thundered its prophecy into the ears of mankind for many years.

We talk of preparation now, Mr. President. A subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate has for the last three months been engaged in hearing experts and other advisers concerning the needs of a permanent Army. We have received a mass of information, most of it of great value, and I have no doubt it will enable us to formulate something of an intelligent character which the Senate may be induced to adopt.

But during all the discussion which has succeeded the war with Germany, what is it that lies behind this need for preparation? What is there in the world which menaces its future

peace, and which may draw America into another great conflict? There is another nation pursuing the footsteps of Germany, extending its preparation and its power, obtaining foothold in China and Siberia, a nation which took advantage of the last great world cataclysm by imposing upon the helpless Chinese Government a series of demands, 21 in number, the clear purpose of which was to acquire control of all the material resources of that great country, including its population. Why? We do not know. We can only conjecture. But we may reason by analogy and from experience.

We know that autocracy is the antithesis of free government. We feel, therefore, that a nation engaged in constant imitation of a great autocracy which has disappeared for the time, desirous of the possession of the world's commerce in the Orient, chafing under discriminations of race which have been imposed in this country for the best of reasons—social, racial, and economic—with the great Empire of Russia, its once antagonist, prone in the dust, must have some ultimate objective which may be accomplished without war with America, but which may, on the other hand, involve us, for our future is on the Pacific.

Mr. President, I do not refer to this subject with a view of casting any reflection or imputation upon the Japanese people or Empire. I trust that our relations with them in the future will be what they have been in the past, and there is room in the world for the expansion of both. Their generous rivalry in commerce, in the arts, and in dominion, if continued upon the high plane of present civilization and with a constant recollection of the horrors of the last war, must make not only for the peace of the world, but for the well-being of millions of people in Asia and America. But we should prepare, nevertheless.

Let us assume, Mr. President, that our relations with Japan may become strained, that somewhere in the near or distant future a cloud may arise between these nations no bigger than a man's hand, but which may spread over the entire horizon, black and thick with the menace of coming disaster. We may need all the friends that we can secure, and I believe that in such an event, whatever the treaty requirements between Great Britain and Japan may be, America and not Great Britain can count upon Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, for their interests are our interests, and, as to this matter, their destiny is our destiny. They speak the same tongue that we do; they enjoy the same institutions that we do; they inherit them from the same great people which won them by sacrifices untold. They have already gone upon record, Mr. President, when the events of the past have made some action necessary concerning many of the possible differences that may arise between ourselves and Japan. To say, therefore, that in disputes between the United States and other countries the six votes of Great Britain will act as a unit and against the United States, is to assume a situation which does injustice to these colonies, to ourselves, and doubtless to Great Britain.

Let me concede, for the sake of argument, that we find an antagonist in Great Britain, either because of her interest in our controversy or because of her treaty obligations to our adversary. I think, Mr. President, that we can safely hope for and surely depend upon her great western dominions as to every oriental problem which may present itself for our solution. I am quite content, therefore, with a reservation which precludes the possibility of their preponderant action as to disputes in which any of these members are concerned, and particularly with us, believing that the hand of good fellowship and confidence extended from the United States to these dominions will bring a future fruition the need of which in some great and momentous crisis may be so urgent that without it our Nation might become subject and our institutions disappear. I shall, therefore, Mr. President, vote against these amendments.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, this treaty runs in the name of "His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the seas, Emperor of India, by," and then follows the names of the Right Hon. David Lloyd-George and others who signed in behalf of Great Britain; and then "and for the Dominion of Canada by the Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, minister of justice," and so forth; and then "for the Commonwealth of Australia," and so forth; then "for the Union of South Africa"; then "for the Dominion of New Zealand"; and then "for India" by certain gentlemen.

The treaty proceeds in the name of His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and so forth, and names the other sovereignties—the United States, France, and so on—all parties upon one part and Germany, the party of the second part. As the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] stated the other day, the composition of the British Empire is somewhat peculiar and involved. But, Mr. President, I assume

that when the various sovereignties met in the peace conference they met as equals, for, if I understand it correctly, in contemplation of international law the sovereign nations are all upon an equal basis. There is no distinction made either by reason of population or wealth or any other consideration. No matter how large or how small or how old these various sovereignties may be, in contemplation of international law they are equal and they are equally sovereign.

Now, as it seems to me, there has resulted in this treaty a queer condition of things. Whether it was by design or by accident I do not know. At any rate the British Empire, as such, including its self-governing colonies and dominions, has six votes in the league of nations created by the treaty. The British Empire has one vote and each of its self-governing colonies, of whom there are five mentioned in the treaty, has one vote. By what theory this came about is not explained. No other sovereignty which was party to the peace conference is treated in that way. If it is true, as claimed by the President and some Senators who take his view about the matter, that the one vote of any other member of the league is equivalent to the six votes of Great Britain, then I fail to see why Great Britain is given six votes, or the British Empire, perhaps to speak more correctly. I do not know who proposed that the British Empire should have six votes and that every other member of the league should have only one vote. No explanation is given.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. For a question, if the Senator will make it a short one. I know the Senator's tendency.

Mr. KING. I think it is a little more than a question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is generally a prelude of an argument winding up with a series of questions, but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. The Senator was inquiring why Great Britain's colonies had votes and why six votes were given to no nation other than the one. Will the Senator say that the United States or Japan or France or Italy stood in the same relation as did Great Britain? We have not any self-governing dominions or colonies that correspond with Canada.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I hope the Senator will come to his question. I knew what I was yielding to.

Mr. KING. I warned the Senator, and he anticipated, of course.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the colonies of Great Britain occupy an entirely different position from Hawaii, Porto Rico, or any possession which France or Italy may have in Africa or in any other part of the globe?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do. They are British colonies. That is the difference in their position. I am not quarreling at all with Canada or Australia or New Zealand having a vote in a league of nations, because I think that, by population and wealth and intelligence and everything that goes to make a nation, they are entitled to it, much more so than the great majority of the members of the league which are given equal representation in the league by this treaty. The trouble is the way the British Empire is constituted and the dual theory upon which they seem to have proceeded in the construction of the treaty which results in their getting six votes and no others getting more than one. The trouble is that the British Empire as a sovereign, meeting the United States as a sovereign, says, "We will take one vote for the sovereign British Empire and we will give you one vote for the sovereign United States of America, and then we will put each one of our self-governing colonies in for a vote also, but no other nation shall put in any of their self-governing colonies or any of their dependencies." That is brought about in an ingenious way; at least, looking at it in the text it appears to be ingenious. Whether it was designedly so in order to gain an advantage, I do not express any opinion, because I know nothing about what was said over there, but no doubt the British colonies, which had contributed such great aid to the mother country in the war—Canada, Australia, and the rest of them—said, "We are entitled to a vote; we really are nations." When those five great overseas colonies notified Great Britain that they had to have a vote, I suppose Great Britain had to yield to them.

The result of it is that the British Empire gets one vote as the British Empire, which offsets the vote of the United States, and then gets five other votes, one to each of its self-governing colonies. It does that, not by saying "We will give to the British Empire one vote and we will give to each one of her colonies a vote also," but she does it not by stratagem, but by the method of saying, "This treaty is made in the name of His Majesty acting for all these colonies, and each one of these colonies shall be a member of the league." Then in another part

of the treaty it says that each member of the league shall have one vote. So by putting its colonies in as members of the league and putting us in as a member of the league it gives each one of its colonies the same vote that the United States has, and then it gives to the British Empire another vote besides.

I have listened to some of the very able arguments made in relation to this question, and to the exceedingly able exposition which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has just made of the reasons which induce him to prefer a reservation to an amendment upon this question. I am not convinced by the arguments of those who have persuaded themselves that a reservation is preferable to an amendment.

Let us see, Mr. President. We are asked, by ratifying this treaty, to set up a league of nations with a council and an assembly. The council and the assembly are to sit abroad in foreign lands. We are to have one representative upon each of those bodies.

Now, the amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations provides, in effect, that the United States shall have six votes if the British Empire and its colonies have six votes; that we shall have as many as any member of the league. The reservation, on the other hand, says, "No; we shall not enter the league upon an equality with the British Empire. We will enter with one vote and give them six votes, but we will put on a proviso that unless we are willing that they shall do so on any question they shall use but one of their six votes."

Mr. President, I submit it is humiliating to me as an American, and I think it will be humiliating historically to the records of this country as a sovereign nation, to meet the British Empire or any other nation and help organize an international tribunal on the basis that we have one vote to another sovereign, no larger, no better, no more powerful than we, having six times the voting power.

Those who favor the reservation say, "We recognize the humiliation and the injustice of it, but nevertheless we will organize it on this humiliating and unjust basis, and then we will have these six British delegates sit there, and we will not let more than one of them vote, when it comes to voting on anything, without our permission." I think that is a more humiliating spectacle than the original proposition which it is designed to correct. To have the great Empire of Great Britain send six delegates to this convention with their mouths gagged, to be simply ciphers there, denied the power of doing anything that the other one is to do, seems to me to be a most absurd situation for a great international league. I do not think the English, if I know Englishmen—and I do know some—with their sensitive nature, would be very much flattered by substituting the proposed reservation as against the amendment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. Upon that proposition, as there has been so much time devoted to the suggestion that it is more difficult to secure acquiescence of the other countries in an amendment than in a reservation, I desire to ask the Senator if he does not think it would be very much more difficult to secure the acquiescence of Great Britain in reducing her vote from six to one and the acquiescence of the other countries in overturning what they have already done than it would be to secure their acquiescence in giving an equal number of votes to the United States, where in that proposition the United States would undoubtedly have the support of Great Britain, unless Great Britain's intention is to have more influence or power in the league and in the council than she gives to the United States?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I thank the Senator for his suggestion, to which I agree. There can be no question, of course, that the nation which has six votes in the assembly has more power. This is put in for a purpose, of course. Nobody proposed that the United States, altruistic as we were, should have six votes and Great Britain one. It may have all been luck or a happy chance or the wisdom of Providence that accounts for this. I do not know. But you do not happen to find it that way—that we have the six votes and Great Britain has the one. So it fortuitously occurs that they enter upon this scheme six times more powerful than we are. Everybody agrees to that. If the people who want to supplement the amendment with a reservation do not agree to that, they ought not to offer their reservation, which is designed to correct the inequality not by putting us where we belong in comparison with Great Britain, but by gagging five of Great Britain's delegates.

Mr. President, it is a curious contrivance. I am not attempting to justify it; I am simply wondering at it. I am astounded at the moderation of the British Empire that, having gotten one vote for the British Empire and then one for each component part of the British Empire which was overseas, it did not take one for every part of the British Empire. Why

were they so generous as to give a vote to New Zealand and to India, which is not even self-governing and not populated by whites, and not give a vote to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield.

Mr. FALL. I think that is easily understood. Great Britain has been promising home rule to Ireland for a great many years, but has never given it. If she gave Ireland equal representation with herself in the league of nations, certainly she would logically be compelled to grant home rule.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will permit me to add to his statement, that fact is due to the opposition of Ulster more largely than to the refusal of Great Britain.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, there is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; there are England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. They are the parent of the British Empire. They do not get a vote. The British Empire gets one vote; the United Kingdom is a part of it; they get none; but the colonies do get votes. Upon what theory they are proceeding is somewhat interesting as a study; but, no matter what theory may be formed or by what reasoning one may account for the situation, the fact remains that the British Empire gets six votes to our one.

It is said if we also had six votes that would be a great injustice to France, to Italy, and to other members of the league. It would be no more of an injustice to them than it is for Great Britain to have six votes, and they have all agreed that Great Britain shall have six votes. It is understood and asserted by the President and others that, of all the nations of the world, we are the one nation that all the European and Asiatic powers trust as disinterested. If that is so, they certainly would not have any objection to giving us representation equal to that of Great Britain.

The statement of the Senator from Colorado and other Senators that we could always rely upon the support of the Republics upon this continent to my mind is not quite conclusive. Without going into the attempt to imagine what sort of questions will be brought before the assembly or what disputes may be referred either to the assembly or to the council, I think it ought to be patent to everyone who is familiar with our diplomatic history with other nations upon this continent that it is not at all certain that in an international controversy they would side with us rather than with some European power. I do not claim at all that the colonies of Great Britain would be controlled by Great Britain; I do not think it is necessary to assert that; and I do not think it can be truthfully asserted. All I say is that naturally a dependency or self-governing colony will be more apt to take the view of the mother country than it will of some other country.

The time to correct this condition, if it is wrong, is now. I think the covenant is practically unamendable, for it can only be amended by unanimous consent of all the members who have representation on the council and a majority of the other members who have representatives on the assembly.

I utterly disagree to the theory that we must not touch this mass of provisions; that we must accept it with all the errors and faults which it has and which everybody agrees are numerous, because if we made any change it would involve the necessity of the other parties to the contract agreeing to the change. Of course, it might, but they are all existent; the cables are working; the peace conference is in session, and the peace conference is subject to the orders of the Governments which appointed it. Even if the peace conference were not in session, the Governments which appointed it could accept any amendment they saw fit to accept. Most of the amendments which have been suggested are amendments which Senators claim to be superfluous, because they already represent the true intent and meaning of the treaty. If that is so they would be accepted out of hand forthwith, without a day's or a minute's delay. So, Mr. President, I regard the assertion that this document must not be touched because it would involve resubmission to the other parties as—I will not say not made in good faith, but I think the design of it is more to prevent any amendment at all than to show the impossibility of successful amendment.

Mr. President, I have seen in the public prints since this amendment designed to put us upon a basis equally advantageous as that upon which Great Britain is put in the treaty has come up for discussion that France says she thinks she ought to have more representation, and that she agreed to this scheme because she supposed she had to. I can see no earthly reason why, if Great Britain's dependencies are members of the league, the dependencies of France should not be members of

the league. It is even discussed in England to-day that they ought voluntarily to relinquish this advantage. They themselves know that it is wrong, and yet we do not seem to have the courage or disposition to correct a manifest injustice at the only time when we can correct it.

If in the future there were no practical injustice or disadvantage connected with it at all, as a practical thing I would not have it known that on a record vote here I voted so to minimize my Nation as to put it on a one-to-six basis with Great Britain. I have heard it said as a nursery tale and fable that it took nine tailors to make a man, but heretofore I have never heard American citizens announce that it took six Americans to make one Englishman, and I will never vote that that proposition is true.

As in legislative session,

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 1377. An act for the relief of Amherst W. Barber;

S. 3096. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Red River at or near Moncla, La.; and

S. 3190. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pocomoke River, at Pocomoke City, Md.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3143) to provide for further educational facilities by authorizing the Secretary of War to sell at reduced rates certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade, technical, and public schools and universities, other recognized educational institutions, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KAHN, Mr. MCKENZIE, and Mr. CALDWELL managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 151) to provide additional compensation for employees of the Postal Service and making an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Oscar Smith;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Perry E. Borchers because of losses suffered, due to destruction of property and termination of contract for services because of smallpox while in the employ of the Navy Department in Cuba;

H. R. 683. An act for the relief of William E. Johnson;

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Ellen Agnes Monogue;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of James A. Showen;

H. R. 6289. An act for the relief of the executor or administrator of Robert Laird McCormick, deceased;

H. R. 7138. An act granting a franking privilege to Edith Carow Roosevelt;

H. R. 9697. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Pearl River, between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La.;

H. R. 9448. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 10107. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Suffolk West Association of Congregational Churches of Boston, Mass., and a petition of the Men's Club of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Newton Center, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty without amendment, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Nebraska League for the Preservation of American Independence and a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the James Connolly Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Taunton, Mass., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty unless certain reservations or amendments are adopted, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Klamath Post No. 8, American Legion, of Klamath Falls, Oreg., praying for the adoption of the so-called Johnson amendment to the treaty of peace with Germany, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 3301) to authorize the disposition of the proceeds from use of the Laguna Dam, Yuma reclamation project, for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 3302) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wheeler;

A bill (S. 3303) restoring to the pension rolls the name of George B. Taylor; and

A bill (S. 3304) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ware; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3305) further to assure title to lands granted the several States, in place, in aid of public schools; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 3306) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Austin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 3307) authorizing the Ottawa and Chippewa Tribes of Indians of Michigan to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 3308) for the payment of certain claims of general officers of Volunteers for three months' pay proper for Civil War service as reported by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 7138. An act granting a franking privilege to Edith Carow Roosevelt was read twice and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 9697. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Pearl River, between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 9448. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 10107. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Oscar Smith;

H. R. 646. An act for the relief of Perry E. Borchers because of losses suffered, due to destruction of property and termination of contract for services because of smallpox, while in the employ of the Navy Department in Cuba;

H. R. 683. An act for the relief of William E. Johnson;

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Ellen Agnes Monogue;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of James A. Shown;

H. R. 6289. An act for the relief of the executor or administrator of Robert Laird McCormick, deceased.

SALE OF SURPLUS MACHINE TOOLS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3143) to provide for further educational facilities by authorizing the Secretary of War to sell at reduced rates certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade, technical, and public schools and universities, and other recognized educational institutions, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. SHEPPARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASED SALARIES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I ask unanimous consent to call up the conference report submitted by me a few days ago on House joint resolution 151, to provide additional compensation for em-

ployees of the Postal Service and making an appropriation therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FRANKING PRIVILEGE FOR MRS. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. TOWNSEND. From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 7138) granting a franking privilege to Edith Carow Roosevelt, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all mail matter sent by the post by Edith Carow Roosevelt, widow of the late Theodore Roosevelt, under her written autograph signature, be conveyed free of postage during her natural life.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. In accordance with an understanding which I had with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] before he left the Chamber, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 27, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, October 25, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Out of the finer instincts of our being, impelled by the longings of our hearts, from the deeps we cry unto Thee our Father in heaven: lead us we pray Thee by Thy spirit into green pastures and by the side of still waters. Restore our souls and lead us into the paths of righteousness for His name's sake; and

Yea, though we walk through the valley of the shadow of death, we will fear no evil: for Thou art with us; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort us.

Thou preparest a table before us in the presence of our enemies: Thou anointest our head with oil; our cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow us all the days of our life; and we shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

So we hope, and aspire, and pray. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—YUMA PROJECT, ARIZONA.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of the bill (S. 2610) to provide for the disposal of certain waste and drainage water from the Yuma project, Arizona, from the Committee on the Public Lands to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands. I have consulted with the chairmen of both committees and a majority of the members, and they have consented to it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 333. An act providing for the disinterment and removal of the remains of the infant child, Norman Lee Molzahn, from the temporary burial site in the District of Columbia to a permanent burial place;

H. R. 446. An act authorizing the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to transfer fractional block 6, of Naylor's addition, Forest Grove, Oreg., to the United States of America for the use of the Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 753. An act for the relief of Susie Currier;

H. R. 2452. An act for the relief of Charles A. Carey; and

H. R. 5007. An act granting citizenship to certain Indians.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the third congressional district of Wisconsin easily ranks with the best in the Nation—equalled by few, excelled by none. There at Mad-